1976

The process of sex-role socialization in traditional and non-traditional families.

Ester R. Shapiro
University of Massachusetts Amherst

THE PROCESS OF SEX-ROLE SOCIALIZATION IN TRADITIONAL AND NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES

A Thesis Presented

By

ESTER REBECA SHAPIRO

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

May 1976

Psychology

THE PROCESS OF SEX-ROLE SOCIALIZATION IN TRADITIONAL AND NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES

A Thesis Presented

By

ESTER REBECA SHAPIRO

Approved as to style and content by:

Harold L. Raush, Chairperson of Committee

Maurianne Adams, Member

Alexandra G. Kaplan, Member

Alice Rossi, Member

Jerome Myers, Department Chairperson
Psychology Department

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee, Maurianne Adams, Sandy Kaplan, Harold Raush, and Alice Rossi. Sally Ives contributed support and a superhuman typing job. Jeff Baker lovingly saw me through the demands of the work. Finally, I would like to thank the participating families, who courageously opened their lives to me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The nature of sex differences and the influences on their development are currently areas of controversy in both the larger society and the academic disciplines. An equally controversial and related question is the present influence and future direction of the family. That these are intensely, personally meaningful issues is virtually inescapable, since as members of a biological and social species, we are born into a sex and into a family. The study of family influence on sex-role socialization, a research literature with a long and respected history in both psychology and sociology, brings these two complex areas of study together. Research on family and sex-roles at this point has to struggle with the pull of traditional stereotypes and assumptions on the one hand, and alternative stereotypes and assumptions on the other, both of which color and cloud the vision. A researcher inevitably brings to the data a theoretical approach with its underlying assumptions, both personal and cultural. It becomes essential to examine these assumptions and their impact on the research process.

This thesis poses and explores some research questions about the process of sex-role socialization within the family. Its theoretical base is a model of androgyny which defines sex-role as the integration of masculine and feminine characteristics, in contrast to the bipolar model of sex-roles which underlies most of the research literature on sex-role socialization. The introduction to this study reviews and contrasts the two models and their different formulations of the process of sex-role

socialization. The study itself examines patterns of sex-role socialization in eight families, four with traditionally allocated adult work roles and four with non-traditionally allocated roles. The purpose of the study is to explore and describe the process of sex-role socialization in both the parent and child generations of these eight families, and to use the data base to further articulate the application of the model of androgyny to sex-role socialization. The case studies describe and integrate the material on sex-role for each family, and are focused around the work role dimension of sex-role which includes household and childcare responsibilities as well as employment outside the home. Work roles are examined in the parental families of origin as well as the present families. The discussion attempts a synthesis of these issues across the range of family structures provided by the case studies.

A Bipolar Model of Sex-role Socialization: Theory, Research, and Assumptions

The study of sex-role socialization is part of the broader area of developmental psychology, from which it draws its theoretical and methodological foundations. Developmental psychology can be broadly categorized into three major theoretical approaches which it offers to the study of sex-role socialization; psychoanalytic, behavioral or social learning, and cognitive theories of sex-role development, These three theoretical approaches to sex-role development will be presented first, to be followed by the research on family influence in sex-role development which they have generated. The discussion builds on a number of recent works which represent the most frequently cited and authoritative sources

in the field (Astin, Parelman, & Fisher, 1975; Kagan, 1964; Kohlberg, 1966; Maccoby, 1966; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1975; Mischel, 1966, 1970; Mussen, 1969).

Psychoanalytic theory is at the same time the most widely discredited and the most influential theory of sex-role development. This work began with Freud's writing (1933, 1937) and was expanded by later theorists (Fenichel, 1945; Bronfenbrenner, 1960). The major mechanism postulated is the process of sex-role identification, a step in the child's development which answers the Oedipal stage question; whom will I love, and whom will I be like? The psychoanalytic answer lies in the differential entry into and emergence from the Oedipal complex for girls and boys. The mother is the first love object and first object of identification for both sexes. Differential sex-role definition is said to begin when the girl realizes that she and her mother are without a penis, rejects her mother as a love object, and turns to her father. She remains identified with her mother and wishes to become like her in order to take her place in relation to her father. The boy keeps his mother as a love-object, and identifies with his father. Castration fears in the boy are resolved by identification with the projected punitive, threatening father. According to this theory, it is in the step to secondary identification that castration anxiety leads to formation of the superego. Since the castration threat is not as strong for girls, they form a superego which is less strongly defined. These different resolutions of the Oedipal complex for boys and girls are assumed to be the foundation of the differences between adult masculine and feminine sex-roles. Men are described as having stronger and more developed superegos which means

greater sense of justice and objectivity, and a phallic orientation which leads to active sexuality and dominance. Women are in contrast less moral, more emotional, subjective, sexually passive and submissive, jealous, and compensate for physical inferiority with vanity and narcissism. Once the object of identification is established, the child then looks to the same sex parent as the source of whom she/he is to be like. In sum, psychoanalytic theory of sex-role development claims that anatomical differences lead to identification with the same-sex parent, and these are the determinants of masculine and feminine sex-roles.

Social learning theorists applied mechanisms from behaviorism such as operant conditioning, positive and negative reinforcement, discrimination, and generalization to the study of sex-role socialization (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1975; Mischel, 1966, 1970; Mussen, 1970). For these theorists, sex-role socialization is a kind of learning to which the general laws of social learning can be applied. The child's attachment to his parents and the parental power to mete out rewards and punishments create the reinforcement contingencies which lead to the acquisition of appropriate sex-role characteristics. Certain patterns of behavior are positively reinforced by the parents, and others are negatively reinforced. Observational learning, where the child learns from the behaviors modeled by the parents, is a further mechanism postulated by this approach. The terms identification and imitation are often used interchangeably in this literature as mechanisms which account for the fact that learning takes place when the parental figure makes no specific effort to reinforce specific sex-typed behaviors. Numerous social learning theorists borrowed from psychoanalytic concepts and combined the two approaches, and discuss

maternal nurturance as a positive reinforcement, paternal threat as a negative reinforcement.

The third major approach is the cognitive-developmental model proposed by Kohlberg (1966), which has its roots in the cognitive stage theories of Piaget and Werner. This theory holds that sex-role concepts change with the child's cognitive stage of conceptual development, the final step which is the child's attainment of sex-role definition appropriate to her/his sex. The child is said to recognize for her/himself that there are two genders, and she/he is like one of them. The cognitive realization is what provides the energy for the child's identification with or imitation of the same-sex parent.

In turning to the research literature which studies family influence on sex-role socialization, the three approaches are not equally represented. The psychoanalytic approach has provided theory which influenced other approaches, without itself producing research studies. Research generated by the cognitive approach such as Kohlberg and Ziegler (1967) correlates level of sex-role conceptualization with other cognitive measures such as intelligence. Most of the family variables examined in relation to children's sex-role development are generated by social learning theory, often through the application of Freudian identification themes. Major parental variables have been dominance (Biller, 1969; Hetherington, 1965, 1967; Hetherington & Frankie, 1965; Moulton, Burnstein, Liberty, & Altucher, 1966; Rutherford, 1969; Ward, 1972) and warmth and nurturance (Hetherington, 1967; Mowrer, 1960; Mussen & Diestler, 1959; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963; Sears, P., 1953; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957; Sears, Rau, & Alpert, 1965). Other studies have used as variables paren-

tal power and consumption of resources (Whiting, 1960), father absence (Biller, 1968, 1969; Burton & Whiting, 1961; Greenstein, 1966; Hetherington, 1966), presence of a working mother (Hoffman, 1974; Hartley, 1960, 1961), age and sex of siblings (Brim, 1958; Fauls, 1956; Houston, 1970; Rosenberg & Sutton-Smith, 1971; Vroegh, 1972), and general sex-role characteristics of the parents (Hetherington, 1965; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963; Fling & Manesovitz, 1972).

The research literature on sex-role socialization routinely uses masculinity and femininity measurement scales referred to as measures of sex-typing or sex-role stereotyping. The M/F scales are used as broad measures of an individual's sex role identity, and define masculinity and femininity as opposite, mutually exclusive poles of a continuum. In general, both adult and child scales force a choice between a masculine and feminine personality characteristic or activity preference. These scales present a number of empirical and conceptual problems (Constantinople, 1973), the most central of which is the meaning of the concept which the scales are supposed to represent. Implicit in this approach is the notion that there exists a linear correspondence between morphological and psychological sex differences, in which femininity belongs to females and masculinity to males. These studies refer to "appropriate" scores and see cross-sex characteristics as indicative of pathology. A somewhat more subtle bias is the assumption of masculine superiority and feminine inferiority. The characteristics measured by these scales remain closely linked to the psychoanalytic views on masculinity and femininity. Masculine as opposed to feminine means aggressive as opposed to passive, dominant as opposed to submissive, rational as opposed to emotional, inde-

pendent as opposed to dependent.

The bipolar approach to sex-role definition and measurement is related to a view of family roles and a set of assumptions about family influence on socialization. The psychological dichotomy of masculinity and femininity has its sociological counterpart in family role theory of Parson and Bales (1955), an approach based in part on psychoanalytic definitions of masculinity and femininity which describes the man's family role as "instrumental" and the woman's role as "expressive." The "instrumental" role is defined as task and goal oriented and corresponds to the psychological definition of masculinity. The "expressive" role is defined as nurturant and relationship oriented and corresponds to the psychological definition of femininity. The assumption remains that these role behaviors are complementary and mutually exclusive. The research literature often views family interactions from the perspective of their contribution to appropriate scores. For example, Biller (1969) in a study of the influence of parental dominance on boy's sex role identity distinguished between "mothers who encouraged their husbands to make decisions while others appeared to prevent their husbands from serving as adequate models by constantly competing with them for the decision-making role." Greatest emphasis is given to same-sex identification, and cross-sex influence is discussed in terms of the complementary teaching of sex-role characteristics. The psychoanalytic importance granted to the early years of a child's development continues in the socialization literature. Since sex-role identity is assumed to be fixed from an early age, the continuity of sex-role identity and the relationship between adult and child sex-role characteristics is not examined. In sum, the

traditional psychological literature on sex-roles and their socialization within the family contains a series of assumptions about sex differences which seem based on cultural stereotypes.

A Model of Androgyny: Alternative Theoretical Approach to Sex-roles

The model of androgyny represents another theoretical approach to the study of sex roles and their development requiring an alternative mode of measurement and approach to research (Bakan, 1966; Bem, 1974, 1975, 1976; Block, 1973, 1974; Carlson, 1971, 1972; Kaplan & Bean, 1976; Pleck & Sawyer, 1974; Rebeca, Hefner, & Oleshansky, 1976; Rossi, 1969; Spence, 1975, 1976). Work in this model is recent and in early stages of formulation. The following review summarizes the existing literature and sketches out some extensions of this approach as applied to research on sex-role socialization.

The androgyny model suggests that what has been defined in psychology as masculinity and femininity are clusters of characteristics which exist independently of biological sex, and may co-exist in any given individual. Bakan (1966) describes these as "agency" which is concerned with the organism as an individual, and "communion" which is concerned with relationships to others. He suggests that these two orientations need to balance each other in an individual, and proposes a developmental approach in which the achievement of this balance is a fundamental life task of the individual. Bakan argues that both of these orientations are of value to an individual, and the goal is the integration of these sets of characteristics.

Numerous writers have expanded variations of this approach, but the

focus is consistently on a more flexible and individually determined definition of sex role. On the level of measurement, the scales which measure androgyny obtain two separate scores for each individual, one feminine and one masculine. Bem (1974) obtains a difference score for the two scales and describes the androgynous individual as having a balance between masculine and feminine characteristics. Spence (1975, 1976) retains two scores for each individual and the term androgynous is applied only to those individuals with high scores on both masculinity and femininity. The distinction between the two approaches is important theoretically. Bem (1976) reports that fewer than 1% of her sample receive "low M and low F" scores. Over one third of her subjects are androgynous, that is have balanced scores for masculine and feminine characteristics.

Rebeca, Hefner, and Oleshansky (1976) criticize the androgyny scales for being too closely tied to the trait focused, bipolar measures they intend to replace. They offer a developmental analysis of a process they call sex-role transcendence, which emerges from stage models of development. They propose that sex-role development proceeds through three stages: an undifferentiated conception of sex-roles, followed by a polarized, oppositional one, and finally a flexible, dynamic transcendence of sex roles. They see the final stage as involving a dialectic orientation, with the individual free to behave adaptively from one situation to another. Block (1973) also takes a developmental approach based on Loevinger's (1966, 1970) work on stages of ego development, and poses androgynous sex-role definition as the highest, integrative stage of sex-role development.

Work in this area is still at a formative stage, and writers primarily address the issues involved in redefining sex role from a traditional, bipolar to an androgynous, dual model. However, most of these approaches raise developmental issues, and Spence (1975) and Block (1973) report work bearing more directly on research in sex-role socialization. Block (1973) analyzed data from two longitudinal studies, the Oakland Growth study and the Berkeley Guidance study. She found a greater number of men than women with androgynous sex-role definitions, and she attributed this to the greater pressure on women of that era to be exclusively relationally oriented than on men to be exclusively task oriented. She further found that androgynous individuals tended to come from families where both parents had non-sex typed characteristics. Spence (1975) reported preliminary findings from a sample of high school students who were administered personal attributes questionnaires and parental home environment scales. She found that androgynous males reported a family constellation of two androgynous parents; high masculine males and androgynous females reported the family constellation of either two androgynous parents or an androgynous mother and masculine father. A number of androgynous subjects, particularly women, reported a "traditional" constellation of feminine mother and masculine father. These results suggest some variations on the traditional identification themes. The characteristics of both parents and the sex of the child were important in the pattern, and the data suggest that it is important to look at characteristics within the two parent and child constellation in more complex ways than are possible within the traditional framework. Block's and Spence's results also suggest the influence of cultural transition

and social change on the sex-role characteristics of women.

The above contrast of the traditional bipolar model with the alternative model of androgyny raises some important research questions. As writers about androgyny suggest, a developmental step which attempts the integration and synthesis of a bipolar stage is a complicated and constantly shifting process. The model of androgyny is in formative stages as a theoretical approach to sex-roles. To apply the individual metaphor, the transcendence of a traditional bipolar model is not a monolithic progression to a clear end state. Conceptual grasp of the synthesis is slippery, and it is easy to fall back into familiar, bipolar conceptualizations. To continue with the metaphor, the dilemma for the individual researcher is compounded by the weight of the widely accepted research literature. The most recent review in the field, the massive and influential volume on sex differences by Maccoby and Jacklin (1975) dismisses the model of androgyny as follows:

> When it comes to measures of sex-typing, the results are puzzling. Children's scores on sex-typing are not correlated with those of the same-sex parent, . .clearly, the methods used to measure sex-typing are relevant here. Assume, for example, that a little girl is copying behavior from both parents; every time she copies a feminine behavior from her mother she achieves a point towards a score that might produce a positive correlation with her mother's femininity score; but whenever she copies a bit of masculine behavior from her father, she not only reduces her own femininity score but moves towards obtaining a negative correlation with her mother's femininity score. If bisexual modeling is what is actually going on in the home, then zero-order correlations between parent and child M/F scores would be the result. Unfortunately, this solution is too glib. Children do not develop androgynously. As has been shown above, the results of many studies are quite unequivocal on this score: by age 4, children on the average prefer toys and activities that are considered by the adult society to be sex-appropriate. Children of each sex prefer to play with other children of their

> sex, although this is more pronounced for boys. These preferences can be demonstrated projectively with the IT test, and they can also be demonstrated in straightforward choices that the child makes on his own behalf in toy preference tests (p. 297-298).

On the basis of this conclusion, the authors then continue to discuss possible explanations of the research findings from within the bipolar model. The model of androgyny and the ways it might be used to reinterpret contradictions in existing research are ignored.

Implications for Research in Sex-role Socialization

In moving toward the synthesis and integration demanded in applying the model of androgyny to the process of sex-role socialization, it is useful to turn to other theoretical work in psychology. First, it would seem that notions of same-sex and cross-sex identification need to be revised to allow for the interaction of sex-role characteristics in the parent pair. To go somewhat further with this point, it becomes useful to draw on family systems theory (Bowen, 1972) which addresses role and individual level of functioning as negotiated consequences of relationships within the family rather than as characterological. This theory takes as important not just the child's relationship to a parent, but the relationship between parents and among all the siblings in the family. Other psychologists have examined the importance of birth order and sex of sibling set (Harris, 1968; Toman, 1966, 1969; Rosenberg & Sutton-Smith, 1972) in influencing individual personality characteristics. This material suggests that the family constellation and its function as a system needs to be examined in studying family influence on sex-role de-

velopment.

The family systems approach of Bowen is also noteworthy for the addition of the notion of differentiation from family of origin, which describes the extent to which a family member can individuate and define a personal self while remaining in contact with the family. This ties in with the developmental approach of Block and Rebeca et al., in which they posit androgyny as a means towards individually created sex-role definition. The family system's notion of differentiation links the individual's developmental process to family relationships, connecting it more closely with issues in socialization. A further notion contributed by Bowen's approach is the importance of examining both the nuclear family and the parental families of origin which preceded it in studying family functioning. This suggests that a trans-generational approach to the study of sex-role socialization might provide important information about the process.

Developmental issues are raised by several of the writers on androgyny, who draw specifically from the cognitive developmental theory of Piaget (1970) and Kohlberg (1964) and the more clinical developmental work of Loevinger (1966, 1970) to describe sex-role development. In applying this material to the study of sex-role socialization, it is useful to add the cognitive developmental approach described by Werner (1948, 1957) which contains a broader statement of stages in the developmental process. The development of knowledge is described as a process beginning with a global knowledge of the whole and a vague and undifferentiated sense of component parts. This is followed by a stage when the global whole is differentiated into parts, which remain separate and are

sometimes polarized so as to be understood. This progresses to a final stage in which the differentiated parts are integrated to form an organized whole. This process goes on at many different levels, and shifts in response to new developmental tasks. Werner states that the initial stages are always contained in the more advanced stages which replace them, and points out that the stress of new life demands is often met with regression to the earlier stages followed by re-organization on a higher level. This developmental approach to cognition is important in relation to both the model of androgyny and its application to sex-role socialization within the family. Development towards an integrated sex-role definition can be seen as a fluid, multi-dimensional process in interaction with situational demands throughout the life cycle, rather than as a single regression. New developmental steps present the opportunity for growth as well as the possibility of disorganization and regression. Similarly, some personality theorists are also moving away from static trait theories towards an approach focusing on the interaction of persons and situations (Bem & Allen, 1974; Bronfenbrenner, 1974; Mischel, 1968; Raush, 1975; Wapner, Kaplan, & Cohen, 1974). A fluid, individual developmental process occurs for each member of a family and not just its children. With the help of family systems theory, this unique growth and response to new situational demands can be seen as interrelated and interactional. The approach suggests that the individual is more than a passive receiver of socializing influences. An individual acts to modify the context she/he is a part of, including her/his family, with varying degrees of encouragement or tolerance for those developmental changes on the part of other family members.

The above discussion raises some research questions in the study of sex-role socialization as formulated from the model of androgyny. Although the mechanisms proposed by the traditional approach still need to be considered and examined, they take on new significance when viewed from the perspective of androgyny. Rather than asking questions only about identification with or modeling of the same-sex parent, one now asks about the spouse relationship, the sex-role characteristics of the partners in a marriage, and the impact of this relationship and its manifestations on the sex-role identity of each child in the family. It is also important to look at the influence of sibling relationships on sex-role development, but this is also viewed in the context of the parental relationships with each child, One further looks at the impact of the child and her/his development on the spouse relationship and relationship to siblings. As part of an approach which sees all family members as developing, one also asks about the relationship of the parents to their own parents in their families of origin, These different dimensions then have to be examined in relationship to one another, and as they combine to form the particular pattern of family influences on sex-role development. In this process, as in life, the whole is more than the sum of its parts.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

The research reported in this thesis explores the family's influence on the process of sex-role socialization through an interview study of eight families, four with a traditionally sex-typed allocation of adult work roles and four with non-traditionally allocated work roles. It is necessary to focus on an explicit component of sex-role for both children and adults in order to examine socialization processes. In this thesis, the work component of sex-role provides the operational focus.

For the adults, work refers to the work involved in household, childcare and employment outside the home. "Traditional" families are defined as having adult work role allocation in which the woman has primary responsibility for household and childcare, and the man primary financial responsibility. This definition of traditional includes families in which the wife is employed outside the home but whose income is seen as supplementary and who retains primary household and childcare responsibilities. "Non-traditional" families are defined as having a work role allocation in which the man and woman share responsibility for household, childcare, and financial support of the family. This definition was selected so as to ensure that a "non-traditional" work allocation involved adjustment in the husband's as well as the wife's role. While a work allocation in which the wife shares the husband's traditional role of financial responsibility is becoming increasingly common, the husband's sharing of the wife's role is a less frequent work allocation. This distinction is central in applying a model of androgyny to sex-role socialli-

zation. According to this model, it is necessary that the husband as well as the wife be integrating "masculine" and "feminine" family work roles. It is further necessary to view household and childcare responsibilities, traditionally the wife's as a valuable contribution to family functioning. Most analyses of change in family roles focus on the wife's movement to outside employment and ignore commensurate change in the husband's role.

A sex-role definition for the children of these families must vary with the children's developmental level, but in general, play and school activities as well as fantasies about future work are defined as the "work" of the child. In sum, "traditional" and "non-traditional" families are distinguished by a behavioral distinction in work allocation. No linkage is made between work role and psychological sex-role characteristics. Psychological sex-role characteristics are discussed as they contribute to the work role choices and the meaning of work for individual family members, rather than as subjects of study in themselves. This approach is in contrast to that of family role theory, which connects the woman's "expressive" family role with feminine characteristics and the man's "instrumental" role with masculine characteristics (Parsons & Bales, 1955).

Sex-role socialization is examined through the process of role modeling and identification as these have been expanded to include and emphasize the family system of relationships. Role modeling is viewed as involving not only what the parents do, but also their own and their children's feelings about what they do. Identification is seen as an active process involving both the child's identification with the parents

and parental identification with a child. Modeling and identification take place in the context of the emotionally charged relationships among all the family members, including the parental couple, parent and child, and sibling relationships.

The study examines the process of sex-role socialization from three levels of analysis. First, the formative influences on the husband and wife are studied through an analysis of information about their families of origin. Second, the development of the husband and wife is seen as continuing through their adult lives, and the study further examines influences on adult socialization such as the impact of life stage transitions and cultural change. The relationship of the marital pair is considered in its influence on the development of the individual husband and wife as well as on their children. Finally, the current influence of the husband and wife, as parents, on their own children is examined as modified by the child's stage of development and the sex-role concepts attained at that age.

Selecting Participants

All participating families consisted of a married couple with at least two children, all born to that marriage. The ages of the adults and children in the families as well as the occupations of the adults are shown in Table 1. The youngest child was in nursery school, and the oldest a senior in high school, at the time of the interviews. Families were recruited through a snowballing method in which a small original pool provided referrals to the other families. In all cases the families were asked to make the referrals only after I had completed the series of

Table 1

Participating Families

Traditional

	couple	age	occupation*	children	age	grade
Warren	Carol	39	p/t reporter	Ann	14	8th
	George	42	f/t biology prof,	Debby	8	3rd
Robertson	Susan	43	housewife	Gail	17	11th
	Frank	45	f/t corp. exec,	Alan	14	8th
Hurley	Lea	40	p/t music teacher	Bruce	18	12th
	Jim	41	f/t philosophy prof.	Dave	17	11th
				Nicholas	16	10th
				Evelyn	14	8th
				Roger	11	5th
Martin	Nancy	33	p/t teach. aide	Danny	13	8th
	Steve	36	f/t acad. counselor	Tommy	13	8th
				Irene	12	7th

Non-traditional

Thomas	Sara	44	f/t administrator	Paul	13	8th
	William	48	sculptor, p/t teacher	Saraellen	12	7th
Greene	Loraine	40	f/t woodworker	Jessica	8	3rd
	Eric	40	f/t woodworker	Marc	5	K
Singer	Adele	38	p/t political science prof.	Richard	12	8th
				Edward	4	N
	Joel	37	f/t English prof.			
Bennett	Judy	38	p/t social worker	Brian	12	6th
	Bob	38	designer	Gloria	8	3rd
				Peter	6	1st

*p/t = part-time employment
f/t = full-time employment

interviews with them. They were told that I was interested in interviewing families with a broad range of work and household arrangements, and was specifically looking for families where the wife worked and the husband had some family responsibilities, or where the husband worked and the wife was a housewife. The prospective participants were contacted by phone, informed that I was from the University of Massachusetts Psychology Department and was doing a master's thesis based on an interview study of families and their development. I also mentioned the referral source and indicated they had already been involved with the research. I told prospective families that the project would involve about ten hours of interviews, two hours with the parents as a couple and about one and a half hours with each individual family member.

I chose this "grapevine" approach in recruiting participants for several reasons. It was a way to do some initial screening and to decide if a given family met my requirements without actually interviewing them for that information. It meant I would get fewer rejections, because informants tended to refer me to friends and neighbors who would be interested in this kind of research project and willing to invest the time required without financial remuneration. The "grapevine" was successful in most of the ways I anticipated, although it also raised some problems. The disadvantages of this approach centered primarily around the social connectedness among the participating families. Some interconnectedness is unavoidable in a small university community, but my approach compounded that. Every family interviewed knew at least one other and sometimes several other families in the study with varying degrees of intimacy, and often knew the faculty members I was working with. This raised issues of

confidentiality which did not pose problems in the interviewing situation but did at the stage of a written report, since these families would be easily identified by someone who knew them even with disguised characteristics. I made it clear to participants that I would be the only person with access to the tapes and transcripts and that names as well as identifying characteristics would be changed to ensure anonimity. I also excluded highly sensitive or intimate material from the final case studies in order to protect the privacy of the families. Each family read their own case study and approved its inclusion in the thesis.

The Interviews

An interview method was selected as most productive in providing the breadth of data I was interested in collecting. It is an approach with a high informational yield, because the interviewer can observe and analyze data on both content and interactional levels. This multiple-level yield was particularly true for the couples interviews. It was often the case that a couple would describe an issue such as an area of conflict which was reflected in the structure of their verbal interaction. Since all interviews were audiotaped, an interactional analysis could be done based on tone of voice, changes in speaking rate, or interruptions. Striking visual information was recorded in the notes taken during each interview session. For example, during one couple's interview the children entered the room and sat down in the proximity of their closest parent. In another, a woman was vigorously rocking in her chair while discussing anxiety provoking material.

The interview design went through several stages. I began working with the first family with unstructured interviews on the couple's rela-

tionship and their individual life histories. This proved to be both too intense and too massive a data-yielding procedure. For the second family I wrote and tested a series of interview questions for the general areas I wanted to cover. This more focused format provided a better balance of depth and breadth of information. This approach further helped me to retain some necessary emotional distance, and hence to remain in control of the extent to which a specific interview explored areas of considerable emotional depth and sensitivity.

The interviewing sequence began with a couple's interview ranging from one and a half to four hours in length. These served to introduce the study as well as to collect information on the family's division of labor and patterns of relationship historically and in the present. The couple's interview was followed by individual interviews with each family member. The adult interviews focused on family of origin material and personal work role development. The child interviews discussed play and school activities, view of family relationships, and description of sex differences. The sequencing of questions was followed flexibly, and fruitful areas emerged uniquely in each interview.

The interviewing process was a demanding one for both the researcher and the participants. I tried to create an atmosphere in which the participants would feel comfortable disclosing intimate material. This meant altering my interviewing style to fit the verbal and conceptual style of each family. Rather than trying to be the same person to all the participants, even had that been possible, I varied my approach so as to maximize willingness to disclose difficult material and so as to equalize level of involvement with the interview.

Another choice was to tread gently and respectfully around defenses, to ask about areas of conflict only as they arose in the context of the interview, and to listen without challenging to the information offered. Interviewing with this intensity and broad coverage can come very close to therapeutic intervention, and I carefully avoided pursuit of information when that was the direction in which it led. I did not suggest connections between different areas to illuminate material, not did I point to contradictions or the presence of anxiety or resistance. These I simply made mental note of and let pass. I had a contract to listen, and not to intervene in whatever adaptive balance had been established, and took this responsibility seriously.

The timing of the interviews allowed me to observe the family's functioning as it occurred spontaneously. I was treated very hospitably, and fed with a range from coffee to formal dinners. Children interrupted the couple's interviews, parents interrupted the child's interviews, and there was always someone milling about before we started and after we finished. These data were recorded in the field notes written after each interview, and helped me come to a more integrated sense of the family's functioning in its daily life. My impression, based on both verbal and non-verbal indications, was that in general participants found the interviewing process interesting and enjoyable, and that this was as true for non-traditional or introspective families as for those with traditional work arrangements or less introspective styles.

Introduction to the Case Studies

The data collected through the interview sequence with each family

is condensed and described in the following case studies. This organization was selected because it provides a means of discussing the dimensions for each family in an integrative form. While it is essential to step back from the individual families to synthesize salient themes and issues, it is also important to view these dimensions of sex-role socialization as they interconnect within each family. The case-studies are structured in the same way for each of the families, and are organized around the following areas:

1. Introduction to the family. Provides brief demographic information about the family members including the work arrangements of husband and wife.

2. The individual adult. Description of present occupation and activities, personal history. This section describes the wife's and husband's family of origin and their personal work history to the point of marriage.

3. Couple's relationship. Describes the shared and differing interests and needs which the couple brought to the decision to marry, and issues in their present marital relationship.

4. The individual children. Describes the children's activities and interests, their peer and family relationships, and their views of sex-differences.

5. Sibling relationship. Describes the relationship between the siblings, patterns of closeness and competition.

6. Family history. Describes the circumstances of major events such as geographical moves, births, and changes in work which brought the family to their present family structure, location, and division of labor.

7. Division of labor and the meaning of work. Describes the distribution of household, childcare, and outside employment responsibilities for the couple. These are discussed for the wife and husband in the context of their personal history and development of their work decisions.

8. Parenting and parent-child relationships. Describes the couple's approach to parenting and the patterns of closeness and identification in the family.

9. Summary of sex-role themes. Extracts salient sex-role patterns for the individual adults, couple, and individual children. Describes patterns of identification in family of origin and present family relationships.

C H A P T E R I I I

CASE STUDIES OF TRADITIONAL FAMILIES

The Warren Family

Carol, 39, and George, 42, have been married for 17 years and have two daughters, Ann, 14, and Debby, 8. They met in 1955, when both were students at the state university where George now teaches, and married in 1959. Carol works as a housewife and has a part-time job in town government. George works as a professor of biology. They are a humorous, playfully loving couple who describe themselves as each other's "best friends." Their style of dress and the layout of their home reflect a sense of their family life: casual and simply adorned, warmly comfortable and hospitable. They live in a rural "suburb" of the university town, which they chose for the intimacy of a small, tightly knit community.

Carol Warren

When we first began the interviews Carol seemed tense and was giggly. She quickly emerged as outspoken, articulate and firm in her views, although she gave the impression of being unsure of herself in some essental way. She is an intelligent and competent woman yet tends to strongly underestimate and devalue her own abilities. This is, in part, responsible for a recurrent struggle, in which Carol tries to fit into a conventional feminine role with her often unconventional interests and competencies. Carol had trouble finding a job in horticulture and worked

as a secretary the first two years of their marriage. She then worked as a housewife and had exclusive responsibility for childcare from her pregnancy with Ann until Debby started school. With George's urging and support, and at first quite reluctantly, Carol took on her present part-time job which she has had for four years. Carol has "seized the day" granted by the children's ages and Ann's excellence as a babysitter, and is spending increasing time in independent activities which include horseback riding, birdwatching, macrame, piano, and gardening. She has recently become interested in the women's movement, and describes her experience in a women's support group two years ago as an important turning point. She became an ardent reader of Ms. magazine and is a member of a school committee to evaluate and replace schoolbooks which stereotype sex-roles.

Personal history. Carol has a disconnected family background. Her mother was killed in a hit-and-run accident when Carol was 2, and she recalls no mention of her by any family members until her wedding day. Since then, she has found out a very few things about her mother: she painted, was interested in animals and rode horses. Carol lived with her father's mother for eight years, and was brought up by her grandmother and two of her father's younger sisters who let her "run wild." Her father lived with them until he went overseas during World War II when she was 5; he returned when she was 8, and lived there until his remarriage two years later. He married a woman 15 years younger whom he met in his work as a buyer for a large department store. Carol was essentially an only child, since her father and stepmother's two children were born when she was in college. Carol describes her father as intelligent and well-

educated with a master's degree from the University of Pennsylvania school of business, but not aggressive or ambitious in his work. He was kind but reserved in their relationship. Her stepmother was a competent housekeeper, pretty and proud of her youth, somewhat moralistic and strait-laced. She took care of Carol but was distant and cold, pushing her to eat more, read less, and have more social contacts.

Carol describes herself as a shy child who read constantly. She was wild and mischievous in early elementary school. Carol was socially withdrawn as an adolescent, and felt awkward about her appearance. Her family relationships seemed distant and she felt much closer to another family who boarded children at their farmhouse where she spent her summers from age 7 until her sophomore year in college. She describes her experience in their home with much greater warmth and vividness than her family relationships, and she found both social contacts and school interests in that space. She was treated "like a star" by the couple and attributes this in part to the fact that in later years she was the only girl among the ten boarders, many of them parentless boys with behavior problems. She became very involved with 4-H activities, and chose the state university because some of her friends were going there as well.

Carol had always done well in school. She was the best academic student in her horticulture major but says she was the worst at applying theory "with her hands." She selected horticulture because her roommate was majoring in it and it seemed like a good choice. She said she was the only one of the six women in her major who didn't enter work related to her field, and it took her eight years of work in her home gardens before she became manually skilled. Because of her lack of confidence,

Carol struggled to master work which didn't fit her skills and interests instead of finding work which suited her. In college she found a comfortable group of friends with similar interests and was more socially active. She met George in her sophomore year, and they quickly began dating steadily.

George Warren

George seems soft-spoken and quietly sure of himself. He is enthusiastic and energetic about his work as biology professor in a large university. He began his career with a focus on research, although he is increasingly becoming involved with teaching. He carries an enormous load of undergraduate and graduate students in individual research as well as carrying teaching responsibilities, and is the coordinator of an interdisciplinary grant project. George has always been involved in a long list of university and community activities, is active in conservation committees and other aspects of town politics and did a stint on the town's volunteer fire department.

Personal history. George grew up in a town outside of Boston, was the oldest child with two sisters, one three years younger and the other six years younger. The family was solidly middle class. His mother was a social worker with a degree from Columbia who worked part-time when his youngest sister was in late elementary school and worked full-time when his sisters were older. She was very successful in her work, and her last job was as director of a large program in Boston. His father taught industrial arts in the local high school, and taught evening courses at a near-by university. George and his sisters were closer to his mother

than to his father when he was growing up. He describes her as a kind, supportive and sensitive person, calm and reliable. She was interested in other people and got along well with them. George said he's become closer to his father since his marriage. As he was growing up, he saw his father as strict and demanding, a meticulous craftsman with a Protestant work ethic and high standards and demands for accomplishments which he applied both to himself and his children. His father was very busy and much less available for contact than his mother, who also placed less rigorous and more appropriate demands on the children. His father's mode of discipline was clear; a lingering disapproval over issues of work, punctuality, and responsibility. His younger sister had the most trouble with his father. She was the brightest of the three, and became an airline stewardess instead of pursuing a career. George describes himself as the "dumbest" of the three academically, and was grateful to his parents that they didn't compare the children, although it is clear that he did this for himself. George felt active sibling rivalry with his sisters which was particularly intense with the oldest, who was more socially poised and outgoing than he.

George describes himself as somewhat socially isolated and insecure as a child, not very athletic and of smaller build than most boys his age. He became interested in wood crafts through nature books he read as a child in his maternal grandparents' home. In college, he decided to major in biology but didn't begin to work hard at it until his third year when he decided he would be continuing with graduate work. He took five years to get a B.S. because of courses he failed in the first years. George was almost engaged to a woman before he met Carol, but they de-

cided against marriage because she was Catholic and he was afraid it wouldn't work out. Soon after they broke up he began dating Carol.

Couple's Relationship

Carol and George were attracted to each other on the basis of shared activities and interests in nature studies. They told me with amusement about their first date, when George invited Carol to go out looking for fox dens in the middle of winter. She dressed with an eye for warmth and comfort rather than appearance, and her roommate moaned that he would never take her out again if she went looking that way. They laughed about this together, and both said that if she'd come out dressed to the nose he wouldn't have taken her out again. In talking about their courtship and early marriage, both of them stressed the role-reversed dimensions of Carol's participation. She didn't have a hope chest, she wasn't eager to marry right away and initially thought she wanted to wait a couple of years, whereas George was the suitor in hot pursuit. But despite these unconventional characteristics, both brought into the marriage more traditionally sex-typed personal concerns which formed the basis for their relationship.

Carol's job situation when she graduated from college was an insecure one. She had an unsatisfactory position at a florist's shop, and after a few months developed an allergy to begonias and had to quit. At that time George was working in Boston, and was making up the time he had lost as a "late bloomer" in his work. Although Carol also describes herself as a "late bloomer," she is referring to the purpose and security she finally found within their marital relationship. She reported with

amusement that her stepmother had thrown up her hands in amazement when after all those years of trying and failing to fatten her up, Carol gained ten pounds soon after the wedding.

Carol sees George as responsible for the change in her life, and feels dependent on him for this. He still takes that role in their relationship, as he initiates, encourages, and oversees her steps towards independence. Carol at times feels angry and frustrated at her dependent position in relation to George, but is mostly grateful that she had the good fortune to connect with a good man. She describes him as dominant and generally follows his lead in making decisions, although she is willing to disagree when she feels strongly about an issue. George sees Carol as vastly underestimating her own competency and strength, and his support and encouragement of her independence is based on his recognition of and respect for her abilities. George's work role has been a primary source of his self-esteem, and the marital relationship has been primary for Carol; this arrangement has resulted in the major friction between them. Carol has relied on their marital relationship strongly, and has struggled most in situations where his support was unavailable because of his work focus.

Ann Warren

Ann Warren, 14 years old and in 8th grade, is a somewhat shy and quiet girl who was quickly at ease with the interviewing and was then quite talkative and articulate about her experience. Ann is sensitive and compliant, self-disciplined, has a high need for achievement and high self-imposed standards in a wide range of interests and activities. She

runs track and cross country and trains daily, she is a flautist and practices diligently so as to make it into the school orchestra. She is an excellent student who is concerned about her performance, and has recently been very upset because she hasn't been doing well in math. She shares the family's interest in outdoor activities and nature studies, particuarly birdwatching, Ann is valued as a responsible and committed babysitter to neighborhood families as well as her own. Because of her interests and activities, Ann does not fit into the mainstream of junior high culture and is having a painful time with school. She has a group of friends who have similar, non-sex-typed interests and characteristics and who are shunned and sometimes ridiculed for their lack of "fit." Ann enjoys being an individual, at the same time that she admits it is difficult to be one in junior high and is not all that sure it's going to get better. Ann feels closer to and more like her father, whom she describes as more patient than her mother and more concerned with seeing a task through. At the same time she clearly admires her mother and identifies with her as a woman who is more concerned with being functional than with being attractive, Ann said she sometimes wishes she were a boy because atheletics are more acceptable for them, but is also aware of different pressures on boys to be aggressive "macho" types. She is interested in pursuing a career in biology or nature studies and perhaps teaching at a university.

Debby Warren

Debby, 8 years old and in third grade, is described by the family as Ann's tempermental opposite. She is loud, brassy, bold, eager to test

limits and catch up to her older sister. She is an active, out-going child who climbs ropes and trees, dresses up her dolls and herself, takes piano and horseback riding lessons which her mother arranged. She is much involved with her two pet mice, which she sneaked home from school and was eventually allowed to keep. She commented that boys are stronger although they don't climb rope as well as girls, and they seem to her to be more destructive than girls.

Sibling Relationship

Because of their age difference, the two sisters share few activities although Debby is following in her sister's footsteps in a number of interests. Ann is amazed at Debby's boldness in growing up, and contrasts her sister's style with new tasks to her own fearfulness as a child. She is a sensitive and nurturant older sister, though she seems to somewhat resent her parents, and particularly her mother's, more relaxed parenting of her younger sister.

Family History

Carol and George lived in Boston for two and a half years, a period which they describe as very happy because of the time they were able to share with each other. During this period they would visit his family every weekend, and Carol half-joked that she married George for his mother. The pattern of their lives was radically altered when Carol became accidentally pregnant, and the series of moves and events which followed marked the beginning of a painful and disequilibriating time. Their life style didn't begin to acquire the stability of the early period until

their return this area seven years later. Because Carol had stopped working and their financial responsibilites were increasing, George took a higher paying position in Kentucky. They moved to a rural area of the state when Carol was five months pregnant, into a small cottage surrounded by an idyllic forest. The unexpected pregnancy, following by the move to an isolated area away from the family she had just acquired, her inexperience with children, her feelings of incompetence and insecurity about handling new situations, combined in an overwhelming way. George was absorbed with the adjustment to a new work situation as well as to the changes demanded by becoming a father, and was not sensitive to Carol's dilemma. She speaks bitterly of this period, and attributes some of the difficulties she had in learning how to be a mother to the fact that she had never really experienced a mother and lacked that role model. She talks about having turned to books when "other girls might have turned to drink or dope or something." George's insensitivity due to his focus on his own adjustments led to some attempts at bolstering his own sense of competence at Carol's expense:

> Carol: The first time she had to be changed, he pushed me aside and said, I can do that. I hovered around anxiously, not knowing what to do with this baby. He knew just about as well as I did which wasn't too much (laughs).

Carol is aware of how difficult this period was for her; she states that even now when she sees a young woman with an infant in a baby carriage she shudders at the memory.

Their next move was precipitated by George's decision to return to graduate school, and they lived in North Carolina for three years while

he completed his doctorate. This was a time when Carol's life became much more comfortable in part because she was adjusting to her role as mother, and also because she had contact with other mothers of young children with whom she could share her experience. George had some trouble returning to the role of student after years out at work, but in general they seem to have enjoyed this period in their lives. After George received his Ph.D., they moved back to Kentucky for two and a half years, where he began work heading a small research group. They had intended to stay there longer, and after a year bought a house and planned the birth of a second child. At the same time that Carol was literally and figuratively putting roots in their new home, George was growing discontented with the limited resources available in a non-university research position. When he received a job offer for a research position at the university where they had met, he was eager to accept it. Carol was at first disappointed, and was willing to make the move only because it allowed them to return to this area and be closer to their families. They have lived here for seven years, and since George received tenure last year they both feel financially stable and rooted in the community.

Division of Labor and the Meaning of Work

The Warrens have had an essentially sex-typed division of household responsibilities from the beginning of their marriage. Carol has been responsible for housework and childcare responsibilities, although not fond of either activity. In recent years she has relaxed about the housekeeping and has involved the children in some housework, but she and George agree that this work is her domain. She complains that the one

place where he asserts his "masculine mystique" is in refusing to call a babysitter for Debby on nights when they are both going out and Ann is unavailable, so that she has to find a babysitter, Carol does not like to cook or entertain, and George would like to do more socializing than they do but is willing to let Carol decide this since she would be doing the work, George takes responsibility for maintenance repairs and manual labor, does some carpentry and built a porch on the side of the house. He now handles finances although Carol did most of this the years he was in graduate school. She does the work of gardening and landscaping their grounds; she says she sometimes gets funny looks from neighbors when she's hauling a loaded wheelbarrow while George stands by.

Work has different meanings for George and Carol which has at various points strongly affected their relationship. In part because George's career has reached a point of stability, and because the children are older and more independent, the focus from their early marriage on George's career development is shifting towards the development of Carol's work. The family's middle class status comes from George's salary as a tenured full professor and not from her small salary which she uses for family gifts and babysitter wages. George at times alludes to the greater importance of his work, and Carol referred sarcastically to George's image of her work as "reading novels and eating chocolates all day." They joke together in describing her town government job as "paid gossip" and as George's "mouthpiece" for his views on town politics. The most central conflict between them has been the extent to which George's work has impinged on their marital relationship and family life. This is an issue they are still in the process of working out,

For George, work is a central part of his self-image and he applies himself to work with energy and commitment, often to the exclusion of all else. His model of adult work comes from both parents, and he describes his present teaching position as encompassing elements and characteristics of both his parents and their style of work. He enjoys teaching one-to-one, and associates this with his mother's skill and sensitivity in working with people individually. He sees himself as having his father's commitment to a wide range of activities which make work part of one's life and not just a section of one's day. Although the financial aspect of work is important, the major moves in his professional development are based on his need to do meaningful work well. For example, his shift to a teaching position meant a decrease in salary and increased insecurity. From the point in college at which he "bloomed" and found his professional direction George has been intently work-focused. Work became a theme around which he organized his identity, and provided him with a feeling of worth and self-esteem which he had lacked as a child and adolescent. Although he speaks of the change in his relationship with his father as having begun with his marriage, it is likely that a central part of that change was George's newly found commitment to his work.

Carol feels that her attitude towards work is related to the lack of expectations and demands placed on her as she was growing up, whereas George's parents taught him that "Provide!" would be an essential element of his role in life. Though she needs financial remuneration less centrally than he, she is also clearly uncomfortable with that imbalance and intends at some point to look for work with a more substantial salary.

Balancing that, she feels she has worked hard as a wife and mother and that she has earned some freedom with the leisure time accruing now that the children are older. She speaks of the trepidation with which she faces job situations as related to her general fear of new situations, although she faces new situations continuously in her present job and is thoroughly enjoying it. Important and related seems her powerfully negative sense of her own competence, which she has reinforced by choosing roles which she had to struggle to fit. Her sense of security and competence has been tied closely to her relationship with George, and her independent steps have been guided and supported by him. He in turn is aware of the discrepancy between Carol's view of her competence and her abilities. He greatly respects her thinking and describes her as more intelligent than he is. These are part of his reasons for encouraging her to work.

Parenting and Parent-child Relationships

Carol and George describe themselves as old-fashioned and dictatorial parents with high level demands and expectations of their children and with clarity about who's in charge. Although discussion of issues is encouraged, when there are opposing opinions it is clear that the parents will prevail. George is described as the "expert" on children, which he attributes to his family experience with two sisters and his work as a camp counselor; Carol attributes his expertise to the fact that he had a social worker mother. Carol said she had little experience with children until Ann's birth, and had never liked being with young children. She states that were she a woman of this generation she probably would have

chosen not to have children. She feels that lack of experience coupled with the difficult situation surrounding Ann's birth have greatly affected her relationship with her older daughter, something she became aware of during her women's support group. Both speak of the fact that Ann was their "icebreaker" and Carol in particular overreacted to events and was overly strict.

Their discipline consists of talking to the children about their expectations, and they feel lucky that the children respond to simple statements of criticism or disapproval so that harsher measures are unnecessary. They see the need to balance demands with sensitivity and flexibility. They feel their parenting style is largely modeled on George's family, since both agree that Carol's family didn't encourage high expectations. George commented that it was only her summers with the Fosters that made Carol "civilized." Both use their own families for examples of things to avoid as parents: George refers to his father's frequently lingering disapproval, and feels it is important to talk something out with the children and be finished with it. Carol refers to her demand that the children not disrupt the adults with tantrums and misbehavior, and contrasts that with the hellish meals she ate at her parents' home with an unruly toddler at the table. They talk about being able to enjoy the children as people now that both girls are older, and want them to experience their parents as people as well.

The family agree among themselves that there is greater closeness and similarity between the pairs of George with Ann and Carol with Debby. This seems to have occurred because of the factors that bring each of these pairs closer together, as well as the factors that maintain a great-

er distance between the "opposite" pairs. George and Ann share birth order, patience, a quiet disposition, and both roll up the toothpaste tube from the bottom. Carol and Debby share loud and volatile emotions, verbal aggressiveness, and squeeze the toothpaste tube from the middle. The bulk of shared activities are within the closer pairs, although Ann also shares some interests and activities with her mother.

Carol spends most of the parental time with the children, and George states that he feels contact with Carol is more important for the girls and will have more impact because she influences them as a role model. He clearly feels a strong tie with Ann; he talks about enjoying her company and deliberately seeking out time with her. In recent situations where Ann needed to talk about some schoolwork she was having trouble with and was very upset by, she turned to George, and he dealt with the situation with great sensitivity and affection. Carol said she was glad Ann had turned to George and he had been available, because she would have been unable to give Ann what she needed. Ann's relationship with Carol has been a difficult one from early on, in spite of the fact that Ann was always even-tempered and obedient. Carol is particularly unwilling to put up with "childishness" from Ann, and Ann, in turn, is reluctant to bring her childish needs to her mother. Carol feels that she shut off Ann's expression of emotions, and feels she has been much more relaxed with Debby both because she was more experienced and the pregnancy was a carefully planned one. She says she was lucky Debby wasn't first born or she would have stopped at one. Carol thinks this difference in her own development accounts for Debby's greater emotional openness and volatility. Carol deals with Debby's moods by taking the

time to comfort her and "jolly" her out of them. George seems to feel that Debby needs more control of her "gall and brass." He joked at one point that "Debby needs to be stepped on every once in a while," to which Carol mockingly replied: "Put her in her place, huh? (laughs). Oh, goodness--keep the natives from getting restless." It is clear that George follows Carol's lead in disciplining Debby.

Sex-role issues in parenting have become salient for Carol since her experience in the support group. At that time, she realized some of the patterns that had developed between her and Ann, and has been working to change them. She is spending more time with Ann in shared activities and is encouraging her to think of herself as independent and competent. Both parents support Ann's athletic activities and her style of dress which does not conform with the expectations for a "feminine" girl. For Carol, this concern is tied to her link with the feminist movement, which has provided her with support for alternative women's role models. For George, this is a decision which he ties to his family experience of a competent working mother and intelligent sisters. He is somewhat jokingly condescending of the feminist movement. Carol encourages the girls' wide range of activities, at the expense of some of her free time which she spends shuttling them around. She is aware that she has not presented the kind of role model she would like the girls to be influenced by, and although worried by that, she is also very actively attempting to influence their sense of competence and independence in the present. These parenting issues have much more meaning for Carol than for George, and this difference is something that Ann has noted and is concerned about. At one point during our interview, she talked about having wondered whe-

ther her father would attend more to the raising of a son. She brought this up in terms of the unfair differential treatment which a neighboring father showed his youngest son in favor of two older daughters, and was disturbed by the fact that with the father's training the boy was outstripping his older sisters in athletics.

Carol is pleased by how the girls have developed "in spite" of her mistakes as a mother. She is aware of the changes in her own development: at one point early in the couple's interview she spoke of the children as having reached a stage of equilibrium, then later said it was she who had reached equilibrium and felt more on top of things than ever before. George is becoming more involved with the family at this point, and is particularly interested in developing closer relationships with the children as they grow older.

Summary of Sex-Role Themes

The Warrens are a couple with traditional work allocation who combine traditional and androgynous interests and family relationships. Carol has androgynous interests and characteristics, yet her more traditionally feminine insecurity and dependency on George have impeded her developing the more androgynous work arrangement she would prefer. Her inability to carve out her own adult work role seems related to her insecure family situation as a child, particularly her lack of a maternal relationship. She has found personal strength and direction in her contact with the feminist movement over the last three years, which has supported her individual growth and change in her parenting role. George is androgynous in a number of personal characteristics although his most

central sense of self emerges from his intense work focus. He identifies his work interests androgynously, with his mother an important early influence and his father more important to him beginning later in his college years. Carol and George's marital relationship combines their personal orientations to work in a traditionally sex-typed relationship. Carol relies on the marital relationship for her most important sense of self and George relies on his work. These differences have been sources of tension in the marriage. Carol is moving towards greater personal growth and independence, fueled largely by her interest in the feminist movement and supported by George. George feels sympathetic towards the goals of feminism in relation to Carol, but doesn't see feminism as a viable ideology for his own change. His growing interest in their family life is generated by his present work role stability, Carol's demands, and the children's maturation.

Ann Warren, 14, has androgynous interests and characteristics, for which she feels marginal in her junior high school. She feels closest to her father and strongly identified with him, at the same time that she identifies with the most androgynous characteristics of her mother. Debby, 8, is also an androgynous child who identifies with her older sister and her mother. While many of her interests, activities and personality characteristics reflect the androgynous influence of her family relationships, her concept of sex differences is clearly at a bipolar conceptual stage, and she is exploring both extremes of typically masculine and feminine interests. Carol and George share an approach to parenting modeled after his family. George is considered the expert on children in spite of the fact that this is Carol's major area of responsibility.

Carol's distance from Ann and closeness to Debby has arisen out of the painful circumstances surrounding Ann's birth and early childhood. Carol has been a strict parent with Ann and a more nurturant parent with Debby. George's pattern has been the reverse, with a more nurturant relationship to Ann and a stricter one with Debby. Both adults illustrate the active parental role in the process of identification. Carol has brought her feminist interests strongly to her parental role, and sees it as important to counterbalance the impact of the traditional role she has modeled.

The Robertson Family

Susan, 43, and Frank, 45, have been married for 20 years and have two children, Gail, 17, and Alan, 14. They met in 1952 on a blind date for a New Year's Eve party in New York, when Susan was in her sophomore year in college and Frank was on leave from the Army. Susan is a housewife, and Frank is an executive for a local corporation. They are a sophisticated couple with a pace and style more at home in the New York commuter setting where they lived most of their married life than in the small, rural university town where they now live. Their house reflects the careful elegance of an upper middle class suburbian home, although their dress and life style are beginning to adapt to rural New England.

Susan Robertson

From the beginning of the interview Susan was energetic and confident, spoke clearly and assertively with an easy and somewhat caustic sense of humor. Susan has responsibility for the household and childcare,

and works the equivalent of a half-time job as a volunteer fund-raiser for a women's political organization. Susan was much more active in this work when the family lived in New York, and she had been active in that organization since the year before Paul was born. Their move to this area because of Frank's work came at a point when her work was beginning to develop exciting career possibilities, and the move was a family crisis intensified by Susan's dilemma. Although she was at first very uncomfortable in this community and felt uprooted and displaced, she as well as the rest of the family are now regaining equilibrium. She is considering bringing her administrative skills to some kind of paid work such as organizational development, although she feels no intense pressure to find a job. Susan gardens in the summer, is physically active, and plays golf regularly in addition to the athletic activities shared with the family.

Personal history. Susan was an only child born in the middle of the depression in Vermont and she guesses that her parents didn't have more children for financial reasons. Her father was a sweet and quiet-spoken man who prefered his gardening to his work as a bookkeeper and clerk. He was not very ambitious, and would have enjoyed farm life. Her mother was a teacher, a strong and domineering woman who was the real head of the household, and who liked her house and her children neat and under control. Susan's mother worked when Susan was younger until she was in late elementary school, then went back to school for her B.A. when her daughter left home for college. They were not an affectionate or emotionally demonstrative family, though Susan had a playful relationship with her father. Although she didn't feel close to her mother, she was

highly influenced by her, and she describes herself as a "very good girl" under her mother's thumb. She was strongly encouraged and directed to be studious and obedient, and under her mother's watchful eye became salutatorian of her high school class. Susan describes her life at home as highly structured. She wasn't permitted to have her own opinion, and she acquiesced because she didn't feel it would have been worth the effort to rebel.

Susan describes herself as outspoken and domineering with girlfriends with whom she would get into screaming fights. She said she was chubby as a child, and though she was active and participated in some athletics she felt dowdy and unnoticeable. Susan didn't date much as an adolescent, and felt tongue-tied with boys. In 1950 she went to a small college in Vermont which her mother had selected; she did well academically and had close girlfriends although she remained shy with boys. Susan felt she had been so thoroughly programmed by her mother that she carried that structure around with her once she left home. She was an English major because she enjoyed the subject, although she now feels business would have been better for her. Frank was her first serious male relationship, although she never felt very involved with him during their courtship. She and Frank were engaged when she graduated from college in 1954, and married a year later.

Frank Robertson

Frank is warm, playful and affectionate in his family context, but he becomes stronger and more directive when he talks about his work as an executive in the local company which is his present focus of energy.

Frank had begun to work in corporations after graduating from college with a business degree, and worked his way up through a number of corporate positions centered in the New York area. He suddenly lost his job in 1973 as part of a company-wide austerity sweep and was unable to find another in the area. Since the move here he has cut back completely on community activities such as church, choir, philanthropic groups, town government, and volunteer fire department in which he was quite active in New York. He retains a passion for carpentry, and spends some free time in his basement workshop.

Personal history. Frank was born in New York City, the only child of immigrant Danish parents who met and married in New York. Because of the depression, his father put aside his work as a skilled carpenter and master craftsman to work as a beautician with his wife, and they worked in this business together for 25 years. His father was an extremely hard worker, nervous and high strung, stubborn and fiery tempered. His mother was quiet and devoted to her husband whom she catered to and was dominated by. Although they were economically middle-class, they had a thrifty and insecure immigrant approach to money and always lived in an apartment above their shop even as their business prospered. They lived in the upper-middle class suburb of their clientele, and all of Frank's friends through school were the children of professionals. His parents, however, socialized with the town's "servant class" and had a chip on their shoulder in relating to the professional community. Because of their long, seven-day week work schedule, Frank had limited contact with his parents. He received more warmth and sympathy from his mother but felt closer to his father, whom he admired tremendously and with whom he shared an in-

terest in carpentry.

Frank describes himself as a shy and sensitive child with, however, a gang of close friends whose mothers were his parent's customers. He was a good student, structured and responsible. His parents strongly encouraged his education. His father pushed him towards a career in engineering and Frank enrolled in a technical high school. During his senior year he held a high-paying job in an office. He performed well but not spectacularly in high school, and he feels he was accepted at a prestigious school because of a friend's help and not on the basis of his academic record. He flunked out of school after a semester, describes this as a painful and terrifying period made worse by his father's disappointment and the strained relations between them that ensued. He decided to enlist in the Army a few months later, which he describes as an escape at a point when he saw no other alternatives. As an adolescent he dated one steady girl at a time from his group of close friends. After he met Susan, he decided to leave the Army and go back to school. On his discharge in 1954 he enrolled at a private university in New York City as a business major. This was shortly after their engagement, and Susan was now living in New York.

Couple's Relationship

Susan and Frank were attracted to each other from their first date. They began a courtship through correspondance because Susan was still in college and Frank in the Army. Both admit that Frank was much more interested in the relationship, and they note that he sent two letters to her one. They describe their first year of marriage as very happy. They

lived in a tiny basement apartment and Susan supported Frank with her secretarial and administrative position through his last year of school. Susan feels that this period in their relationship helped her to open up and become more outgoing. They were very active socially, enjoyed living in the city and went frequently to plays and concerts. Susan thinks she could be as domineering a wife as her mother if Frank would let her; and though she is verbally dominant, he is also assertive and his easy-going manner has a trace of his father's stubbornness and temper. Frank has been warmer and more affectionate from the beginning of the relationship, and remains the hot pursuer of the cooler Susan. They socialize actively as a couple, take an annual vacation, and are still in contact with friends from their college and New York days. They discuss their separate days over a drink when they come home in the evening, and Susan gives Frank feedback and advice more often than the reverse. The relationship has served as a satisfying base for the pursuit of their independent and family activities and was highly stressed only during the period surrounding their move to this area.

Gail Robertson

Gail is 17 and in 11th grade, a tall, shy girl with a wide range of interests and skills. She is interested in athletics as both participant and spectator, loves to watch football, and her carefully decorated room is plastered with football posters and pennants. She is on volleyball and track teams, plays golf and tennis, sews, plays the piano, has an artistic eye and is skilled at crafts such as macrame. She is a competent and responsible babysitter in high neighborhood demand, and an excel-

lent student with an interest in science, particularly astronomy and biology. She has always preferred activities alone although she has some casual girlfriends from school with whom she occasionally goes out. Gail becomes even shyer when talking about boys and is not yet a participant in adolescent romances. She is a distant member of the family who keeps her thoughts to herself, and gives the impression of not being particularly introspective about her experience. When she talks about the future, she hopes to be married and is not strongly career-oriented. Although she regrets not being a boy because she was unable to play football, she doesn't feel that being a girl makes a difference in other ways, and she believes that a woman can make a place for herself in the work world if she chooses to do so.

Alan Robertson

Alan is 14 years old and in eighth grade, more interested in school for the social contacts than the academics and is doing average work as a result. He is active in school and town sports, builds intricate and creative car models, airplanes and war scenarios, is presently building a complex terrain for his set of electric trains in his father's basement workshop. Alan is a sensitive and openly affectionate family member and an enthusiastic participant in family activities. He is described by his parents as insecure and oppositional, and as more fearful, emotional and dependent than Gail. He has an easy relationship with boys at school, expects to be dating soon although at this point he and his friends are at the stage of furtive laughter, off-color jokes and some group flirting in classes. Alan talked with assurance about his future work and his in-

terest in being a carpenter like his grandfather. He likes to build things and will be going to a technological school. He thinks it is important to have a direction, and doesn't want to go to college just to play around. He feels that men and women are equally competent and believes they should be able to do the same kinds of work and that the present discrimination against women in work is unfair.

Sibling Relationship

Gail and Alan have fights over matters such as who feeds the dog. While Alan is an adoring younger brother who pursues his competent older sister, Gail is distant and aloof. They feel they have very different interests, and share only their joint family activities. More recently, Gail has been taking a competent older sister stance about Alan's shoddy performance in school.

Family History

During the first years of their marriage, Susan and Frank moved a number of times around the New York suburban area as Frank progressed in his career. They waited to have their first child until Frank was out of college and could find work. Susan was unable to become pregnant for a little over a year. After Gail's birth in 1959, Susan was briefly hospitalized for hemorraging brought on by her quick return to a full schedule of activities. Alan's birth in 1962 was easier for Susan as well as more pleasurable. She breast fed him based on her doctor's recommendation for health reasons, and recalls with amusement that she enjoyed the experience until they began sticking together in hot summer

weather.

The Robertsons felt firmly rooted in the New York area as well as in their community, and the move which became necessary when Frank lost his job triggered a family crisis. Although the whole family was clearly affected, Alan actively "symptomatized" the tension around this period and for a time was sick during the school day. They had lived in New York since Gail's birth in 1959, and in their same community from 1965 until their move in 1973. Frank was unable to find a job in the area, and five months later was offered his present job. He came alone to this area first, to try out the job and decide whether it would work out before re-settling the family. The family joined him after five months. Frank says that he had always hoped to live in a rural area, and was glad for the opportunity to change his job. He thinks that the move was much harder for the rest of the family and especially for Susan. However, he found the move harder than he had anticipated, and it is likely that he was forced to take an exaggerated positive stance to balance Susan's powerfully negative one.

Susan felt strongly enough to consider divorce at that point. For her it meant coming into a new community and starting from the bottom in establishing themselves, as well as giving up her position in the organi-zation where she worked. Both still feel alienated in a university intel-lectual community. They see people as less friendly although they are beginning to establish social contacts. Susan commented that in her New York community she was one of the most politically activist women she knew, whereas here she feels like a conservative. Frank is always asked what department he teaches in, and feels like he can't compete verbally

and intellectually in this community. They are establishing themselves more comfortably now, although it is clear that their strongest personal and social ties remain outside the area.

Division of Labor and the Meaning of Work

Susan has been responsible for the household and childcare since their marriage. She describes herself as a fussy housekeeper who enjoys the end result and thus the process, Gail helps her with setting the table and clearing it in exchange for her weekly allowance, and also does some cooking. Susan and Frank divide up the handling of finances, she pays the bills and budgets, he makes deposits and balances the checkbook. Susan does gardening and some yard work including mowing the lawn; she states with amusement that this is all part of her "neat problem." Frank does minor repairs, cuts wood for their fireplace, and Alan is more likely to help with yard work than indoor work, although he is responsible for cleaning his own room.

Frank's identity is closely tied to his complex feelings about work, and his period of unemployment forced him to face some of these issues. He sees his work as heavily influenced by his relationship with his father in terms of both what he chose to do and what he truly wanted to do. Frank feels that he would have opted for carpentry had his parents, particularly his father, not pressured him to achieve in a profession, He changed corporation jobs several times with increases in salary, yet never felt like he truly "fit" the corporate image. He ended up in a management position which he lost in an austerity sweep. He was aware of the steps the company was taking and felt that with his incon-

sistent work history, age, and lack of "fit" he was sure to lose his job, yet it was still very painful when he was finally notified. Frank was initially very scared and upset, and shortly after became numb and turned his attention to looking for job possibilities. In looking back, he realizes it was a personal crisis of great proportion, although he didn't experience it that way at the time. To some extent he's now glad that an external event forced him to leave a job he wasn't challenged by. His period of unemployment brought him in contact with affirmative action programs, and while he supports the goals of the women's movement he feels bitter about his disadvantage in the job market as a white male.

At this point, Frank is happy with his present job. He feels actively challenged by the freedom of his position in a small company, but admits it is exhausting and high pressure. At the same time he is canvassing the newspapers for business opportunities to which he could devote evenings and weekends. His goal is to become more independent in his work, and eventually to run his own business rather than to work for someone else. Frank's work ethic is strongly derived from the influence of his hard-working parents, and he incorporated their disapproval of the non-professional at the same time that he wished to become one. Although Frank is now strongly committed to seeing his job through successfully, he is clearly moving in the direction of work in which he can at least apply his own pressure.

Work has a very different meaning for Susan, and the paradoxes in her work life and personality seem strongly linked to her experience in her own family. Susan feels she was taught to look to outside sources for direction, and that without her mother's influence she wouldn't be

highly achievement motivated. Until this point, Susan's work choices have been largely determined by conventional role expectations, although she brought to these unconventional skills and characteristics. She was an excellent English student, and continued for an M.A. from a New York university after Gail's birth, while admitting that she should have been in business. She worked competently in secretarial and administrative positions until Gail's birth, and after getting her master's degree began her serious involvement with the political organization. Her work with this group is an example of the competence and skills she brought to a conventional role. At the point when Frank lost his job Susan had been appointed to a state government legal action committee, would shortly have been the organization's state president. As a result of her committee work she had begun to consider the possibility of law school. Her present fund raising work requires aggressive energy and organizational ability, and she is considering looking for similar work in financial development for the future. What she seems to find difficult is to actively choose an area of interest and create her own work structure. Although she has her mother's aggressiveness and sense of competence, she remains the "good girl" waiting to be told what to be competent at. She is presently taking some time to decide her future work steps. Susan admits she is being influenced in this by the feminist pressures in the community that women should work. She feels no pressure to work simply to earn a salary and will wait for an interesting opportunity.

Parenting and Parent-child Relationships

Susan has been the parent responsible for childcare. She feels

that because of her general distance and lack of warmth in relationships she isn't a "good mother," and she states that while the children were growing up she most enjoyed the time when they were asleep. She describes herself as a "pusher" who stands behind them to see that they get certain things done. Susan links this characteristic with her mother's parenting style, although she sees herself as far looser and less controlling with her children than her mother was with her. She generally handles discipline, and her style is to outyell the children when they refuse to do something she has requested. She ways that Gail simply requires a stern voice, whereas with Alan she has to be far stronger in stating her demands. Frank is for the most part uninvolved in discipline. He becomes angry less frequently but angrier when he does so. Frank is more affectionate, but has been distant because of his work focus.

The family defines closeness in terms of shared activities. Alan and Gail see themselves as closer to their mother because they see her more often and spend more time with her. The parents see themselves as closer to the same-sex child. Frank and Alan share an interest in carpentry which they do together in Frank's basement workshop. Gail and Susan share more activities and interests, although their relationship is emotionally distant. Gail keeps her thoughts and emotions to herself which disturbs Susan who expresses herself at full volume. Gail is going through a period where she feels very distant from and somewhat embarrassed by her father, which Frank is hurt and puzzled by. Susan and Alan do less together but appear emotionally close, and Alan turns to his mother for help and affection more than to anyone else in the family.

Susan is very ambitious for the children and has pushed them both

to perform well academically. She has convinced Gail to take Latin to improve her vocabulary and thus her SAT scores, and is presently battling with Alan so he will do the same. She says that the difference between Gail and Alan is that Gail will protest but take it and do well; Alan will protest, take the course and flunk it to have the last word. She has also encouraged them both to be active socially, but has had more success with Alan than with Gail in this. She is trying to get Alan to work harder in school; she believes that he doesn't try something if he's not sure of quick success. Frank is much less interested in the children's academic success, and he links this to the fact that school was never an important part of his experience. Although Frank expresses ambivalence about evaluating the children on the basis of their academic performance, he has let Susan "take over" in that domain. He has seen it as important that the children have professional lessons and become competent in skills like sports and musical instruments.

In both same-sex parent and child pairs, the parents seem to be identifying with the child at the same time that they identify with their own same-sex parent, in this way creating a duplicate of that relationship in their own family. For Susan, this means being the controlling mother of the "good girl" daughter. Susan is both demanding of Gail and somewhat mistrustful. She wonders about what is really going on in Gail's mind as her daughter goes through her obedient steps or silently "digs in her heels". She tends to see both children more critically than Frank does, although she seems to be more consistently critical of Gail than of Alan. In spite of the fact that Gail and Alan both have areas of acquiescence as well as of rebellion, Susan seems much angrier at her inabil-

ity to more fully control Gail. Gail in turn remains aloof and obedient, and seems to be replicating her mother's pattern of handling her responsibilities with spectacular competence while taking initiative only in limited ways.

For Frank, the identification with Alan means trying to give his son the option to do work that he never had because of his father's ambitions. Frank said that he would be happy if Alan were a trucker or a carpenter, and intends to encourage him to see his work options more broadly than Frank was able to do. In spite of this conscious intention, Frank also communicates to Alan the lack of satisfaction and tension in his own life between the standard of achievement his father demanded and the work interests modeled after his father's skills. Alan seems to be responding to both the conscious and unconscious messages from his father, and as he talks about his future he duplicates his father's pattern. Alan says he is interested in carpentry, so he's going to engineering school, his grandfather's choice for his father. A further replication of the three-generational pattern is insecurity about work competence. Both grandfather and father attempted to master roles they were unsuited for. Alan is described by both parents as insecure and as attempting only those tasks which assure him of quick success. It is possible that Alan's strong symptomatic response to Frank's work crisis was connected to his identification with his father around that issue.

The relationships between the opposite sex pairs are played down at this stage, although they seemed to be closer when the children were younger. As the parents describe it, there was easier affection between Alan and Susan and between Gail and Frank, although Alan and Frank have

always been the initiators of physical contact. This affection remains easy between Susan and Alan, although Gail now rejects her father's attempts at closeness. There was no mention of physical closeness between the same-sex pairs, in spite of their greater closeness in activities and interests. There seem to be some important personality characteristics shared by the opposite-sex dyads. Susan and Alan are both described as more socially outgoing and more verbal; Gail and Frank are described as more solitary and more withdrawn.

Summary of Sex-Role Themes

The Robertsons are a couple with traditional work allocation who combine traditional and role-reversed interests, characteristics and family relationships. Susan has strongly masculine as well as feminine interests. Her masculine interests and her character are related to her identification with her controlling, role-reversed mother. Although she is assertive and competent, she looks to outside authorities for structure. She tends to select more traditionally feminine roles which she pursues with masculine aggressiveness and concentration. She finds her greatest satisfaction in her volunteer work and housework which give her a sense of accomplishment, and she describes herself as cold in her family relationships. Frank is nurturant in his family relationships, but his absorption in his work role makes him a largely unavailable family member. He derives his work focus and achievement motivation from his identification with his father, who made strong occupational demands which Frank has struggled to meet. At the same time, he feels dissatisfied with his work and would have preferred to work as a carpenter in

spite of its less prestigious status. He sees himself as moving towards more independent employment, which will remain in an achievement-oriented mold without the high pressure of corporate work. Susan is presently moving towards paid employment, and is motivated by her own work interests as well as the pressure of the feminist community and the financial pressure of approaching college costs.

Gail Robertson, 16, has androgynous interests and personal characteristics, while at the same time approaching her life decisions with acquiescence to traditional role expectation. Although she is an excellent student interested in science, her plans for the future include marriage but not a career. She identifies with her mother, and seems to be replicating her mother's pattern of having androgynous interests and competencies while pursuing traditional roles. Alan, 14, has sex-typed masculine interests and androgynous personality characteristics. He in turn seems to be replicating his father's pattern of achievement-oriented work strivings with androgynous personality characteristics. These similarities between the same-sex pairs seem related to the replication of Susan's and Frank's relationships with their same-sex parents. Susan and Frank have both brought these relationships from their families of origin in spite of their attempts to change them. Susan identifies both with her mother as the parent and with her daughter as the child. She seems to have a greater need to control Gail as opposed to Alan. Frank replicates his father's parenting style of high achievement demands and expectations. He communicates these expectations through his own work decisions which have chose professional achievement and status over personal work preference. At an overt level Susan is the more demanding parent,

The Hurley Family

Lea, 40, and Jim, 41, have been married for 19 years and have five children: Bruce, 18, Dave, 17, Nicholas, 16, Evelyn, 14, and Roger, 11. Lea and Jim met on a blind date when both were seniors in small colleges in this area. Jim is a professor of Philosophy at a large university and a writer. Lea is responsible for the household and childcare and is a part-time music teacher. They live in the large turn of the century house where she grew up which they bought from her family when they returned to this area. Their household combines the warmth and elegance of its history with the chaotic choreography of seven active lives.

Lea Hurley

Lea is an energetic and competent woman who speaks frankly and articulately about her experience. She comes across as strong and mature, with an occasional flash of childhood playfulness. Her love of music is the organizing theme for both her work and her parenting. Lea runs the household which includes keeping track of the family's diverse schedules. She gives private music lessons to children part-time in her home, teaches at a near-by college one day a week. She is involved in what she calls "do-good music projects", which are volunteer work that takes up several evenings during the week. She has seen to it that all the children play a musical instrument with some level of high proficiency, and most of the music groups she works with involve at least one of her children.

Personal history. Lea grew up in this area, had a sister four years older, a brother three years older and a brother seven years

younger. Her father was a violinist and a college music professor. He was a picturesque character with a rough background which he disclosed only to his sons and later to his daughter's boyfriends. He was a kind but distant father, absorbed with and driven in his work. He had a serious drinking problem which was a great source of tension between her parents. Her mother came from a stable, old New England family and worked at the university at the time she met the flamboyant art professor whom she married. She was a competent and pragmatic woman who held her sometimes irrational views very stubbornly. Lea was closer to her mother but was fonder of her father, whom she respected and adored. She describes her oldest sister as the family casualty; she was treated by both parents as ugly, untalented, and dumb, in spite of her musical talent and intelligence. Her father's favorite was the oldest son, who was pushed into a career in art. He had a difficult adolescence and is now working in business and living in California. She had little contact with her younger brother because of their age difference, and describes him as the child of her parent's old age who is now living alone in her mother's summer home and has written a novel.

Lea describes her childhood as lovely and filled with family rituals and traditions; at the same time she describes some tense and highly charged family relationships. Lea was an excellent student of the piano and became an excellent musician. She had a very active social life which centered around a group of friends with whom she attended a summer music camp and states that part of her interest in art was the important relationships it gave her access to. She felt particularly linked to her father with her music, and described the pleasure of playing at school con-

certs with her father as accompanist. Lea went to the college where her father taught because of its music program, and she continued her work at her art. She met Jim during her junior year at a concert in which she was performing.

Jim Hurley

Jim is a serious, soft-spoken man who looks like he has spent a lifetime in turtleneck sweaters and pipes discussing philosophy with a dry sense of humor. He teaches philosophy at a large state university, and does a great deal of writing including original work and translations. He is physically active, enjoys sports and involves the three older boys in athletics.

Personal history. Jim was born in a small town in New York to an upper middle class family. His father worked in insurance and had widely fluctuating finances, which were highly stressful and triggered a heart attack later in life. His mother was a housewife, and began work only after the children had left home. He describes his father as sociable and easygoing, not very involved with the family which his mother complained about. He describes his mother as intelligent and competent though not highly educated, a strong and controlling parent who was insincere and manipulative. Jim was closer to his mother as he was growing up, although he wished he could have been closer to his father. He sees his father as too dependent on his mother, and gives as an example his need of her constant care after his heart attack. He has a sister six years younger who he describes as sweet and considerate, and whom he sees as intelligent and capable although she doesn't think much of her abil-

ities.

Jim states he was an excellent student in school and didn't have to work very hard, which left him a great deal of time for an active social life and romances. He played football and golf in high school teams, but didn't think of it as a professional possibility and thought he would work in science, He selected a college in New England because it had been his father's school. Jim found the first two years difficult academically. He was majoring in science but wasn't doing well enough in math, and got encouragement from his philosophy professors. During his senior year he received a fellowship for one of his papers. He met Lea in the fall of his senior year, and after their marriage in the summer they used the money to go to Europe. At that point he still wasn't sure he would continue in philosophy, and his family expected him to come back from Europe and work in business.

Couple's Relationship

Lea and Jim were attracted to each other and quickly began dating frequently, although Lea remained involved with other relationships. They became engaged in the spring, and Lea became pregnant shortly after, so that their marital relationship had to immediately incorporate their first child. During the first years of their marriage, Jim was absorbed in his professional development and the relationships in his academic world, and Lea supported and encouraged his work and devoted her energy to the children. Their household displays small, formalized signs of Jim's patriarchal dominance, which Lea describes with amusement as a vast improvement over her family's history. In spite of Jim's dominance in

these public spheres, Lea seems the stronger and more dominant personality in their relationship, and Jim seems dependent on her competent management. Because of their active commitments to work and family life, the couple have minimal time for their relationship. They discuss little of their daily lives except for family crises which demand their joint attention. The most recent of these concerned Bruce's poor school performance and emotional crisis, which peaked last spring. Lea wanted Bruce to see a counselor, and Jim felt the problem was not serious enough to warrant that. Lea's opinion prevailed, and Bruce saw a counselor for several sessions which she feels relieved some of the tension of the moment. Both Lea and Jim describe themselves as tending towards depression, which they stave off by keeping busy. Jim is presently undergoing a crisis in his work, which he is absorbed in and depressed about and which is creating tension in their relationship.

Bruce Hurley

Bruce is 18 and a senior in high school, a brilliant chemist who is undergoing an intense adolescent identity crisis. He is doing poorly in school and flunked a semester of English because he resents having to take required courses. He was very anxious and tense during the interview, although he eventually relaxed and was a charming and articulate participant. He runs track which he states he became involved with so as not to be looked upon as an intellectual with no backbone. He plays the piano but isn't as diligent with practice as his brothers. He is essentially socially isolated both from peers and within his family, and though he's grouped with his two younger brothers he is somewhat distant

from them as well. Bruce is undergoing a great deal of conflict with his parents over his poor performance in school, is emotionally wrought up about the situation and disturbed by the intensity of his emotional reaction. He feels closer to his mother because she spent more time with him while he was growing up, although he is angry at her for pushing him to be more disciplined and independent. He thinks there are a wide variety of restrictions on men and women to act in certain stereotyped ways. He feels that women can more easily transcend their sex role than can men, but states that everyone pays a price in attempting to be different. He's interested in going to college and studying mathematics and chemistry, and at the time of the interviews was waiting to hear from colleges whether or not his spectacular college board scores would counterbalance his terrible grades in school.

Dave Hurley

Dave is 17 and in 11th grade, an intelligent boy with intense interests in painting, music, and philosophy. At the time of the interviews, his bedside reading material included Freud's Interpretation of Dreams and Dostoevsky's Crime and Punishment which he had borrowed from his father's study. He was also working on a still-life painting, and practicing the flute daily. Dave does well in school, is somewhat shy, and has recently been withdrawing from active socializing. He states that most of his friends aren't interested in the same things he is. He ran track for a year, but had to give it up because it didn't leave him with enough time for his other interests. He considers himself equally close to both parents, but sees himself as more like his father than his

mother. He sees girls as more socially skilled and less egotistical than boys, although he guesses they're probably as socially confused as he is. He thinks women are more comfortable than men with being the wife of someone who works rather than working themselves. Dave will continue with art for the next few years, although he's not sure he's talented enough to pursue it professionally.

Nicholas Hurley

Nicholas is 16 and in 10th grade. He seems more socially adept and more outwardly concerned with his social skills and appearance than his two older brothers. He is highly organized and self-disciplined, will ask his mother weeks in advance to type a term paper for him on a specified date, and does well in school as a result. He is interested in the arts and humanities, practices the cello several hours daily and is an accomplished musician. He also runs track daily. He experiences himself as more like his mother, and feels his emotional side is more like his mother, although he states he seems more like his father from the outside. He thinks he will pursue a career in music, although he doesn't want to be purely a professional musician,

Evelyn Hurley

Evelyn is 14 and in 8th grade, a bright, articulate, and somewhat flirtatious girl who is trying out and critically assessing the feminine role which she sees laid out for her. She plays the viola but is more interested in the relationships which music makes possible for her than the music in itself, and she's very involved with friends at the music

camp which her mother attended and all her brothers attend. She is interested in writing and has been told she has a good "colloquial" style. She has recently been rehearsing for her part in a school play, and joined an after school field-hockey team. Evelyn feels close to and identified with her mother, but her choice of activities are clearly aimed at her father's attention and she seems to want to be closer to him than she is. She thinks girls are more romantic and frivolous than men, enjoys taking pleasure in her appearance and in relationships, although she sees women as strong and competent, and discusses sex differences with remarkable sophistication and maturity. In talking about what she would be doing when she got older, Evelyn was torn between wanting a free and unencumbered career life as a writer or journalist and feeling that she may want a family and would like to give her children a stable home.

Roger Hurley

Roger is 11 years old and in 5th grade, a serious and intelligent boy who is described by the family as emotionally explosive but gave the appearance of being quite composed. He is in an advanced program in his elementary school and does his homework diligently. He has a great number of friends, whom he rotates during the week so he has a different one over every day which he says he likes to do so he won't get bored with any one. He enjoys playing sports with his friends. He plays the violin, in which hs mother is giving him lessons, Roger spends a great deal of time in his room, in which he built an elaborate miniature doll house full of dolls who are fantasy characters. He has inherited the stamp collections of his older brothers, and the family's collection of

stuffed animals, as well as a bookshelf of children's books all of which are in his room. Roger says he's closest to his mother, and spends a great deal of time with Evelyn, but says he is most like his brother Nicholas. He thinks boys and girls think in different ways--boys are used to being leaders and like to argue, and girls don't. He is interested in astronomy and science, would like to be an astronomer or maybe a teacher of some sort.

Sibling Relationships

Bruce, Dave and Nicholas are grouped by their parents as "the three big boys," and spend a great deal of time together because of their shared interests and activities which includes a quartet that combines their instruments. Within this united front, Bruce is more the outsider and Dave and Nicholas spend more time together. Evelyn and Roger are seen as a separate sibling set which is attributed to their age difference. Evelyn sees the distance between her and her older brothers as caused by their sex difference. Evelyn and Nicholas have a somewhat close relationship which is sometimes flirtatious and often nasty teasing. The older boys argue with Evelyn and "pick" on her, and see her as more emotional and less intellectual than they are: at the same time they are encountering her social and sexual development with some distress which probably accounts for the amount of teasing.

Family History

The Hurleys did a great deal of travelling the first few years of their married life, and their children were born across Europe and the

United States as they moved with Jim's career development. Bruce and Dave were both born in Europe during their two years there while Jim wrote on a fellowship. Nicholaswas born in this area, while the family stayed with Lea's family. Evelyn was born in Vermont when Jim entered graduate school, and Roger was born in Colorado where the family lived while Jim taught at the state university. None of the children's births were planned, although Lea stated that she was glad the children were born consecutively because they could be companions. They moved back to this area in 1965 when Roger was an infant and moved into Lea's mother's home; her father had died the year before. Jim received tenure in 1970, and at this point they feel established in this area although they are concerned about their financial situation as college approaches for the older boys.

Division of Labor and the Meaning of Work

Lea and Jim have an essentially sex-typed division of labor, in which Lea has run the household and taken care of the children since the beginning of their marriage while Jim worked. Jim was a very distant member of the household during their early years of marriage, and only recently has become involved in activities with the family. The children have been increasingly involved in housework, an arrangement which began when Lea held a full time job for a year five years ago and which has continued.

Lea states that she is very happy with her present work arrangements, and chose to give up part-time work so as to be able to keep the household running smoothly. She worked full time as an elementary school

music teacher for a year five years ago, but much prefers to give private lessons which she can schedule at her convenience in her home. She gives her music lessons in what used to be her father's studio and it is clear that Lea's interest in music remains a connection with her admired father. Lea feels that now that the children are older and she has more time for herself, she's going to relax and enjoy it rather than rush out into a job.

Jim is presently going through a crisis with his work. He is having difficulty with the editors of a translation he is working on, has little time for his writing because of a heavy teaching schedule. He did not talk about this during our interviews, but instead stated that he doesn't see himself exclusively in terms of his professional roles. Jim's early work was published and widely acclaimed, and he has not continued writing with that level of intensity or recognition in more recent years. In the future, he would like to do part-time teaching so as to have more time for his writing, which he can't do at this time because of their already precarious financial position.

Parenting and Parent-child Relationships

Lea and Jim describe themselves as highly involved parents with high ambitions and demands for their children. Lea has had them all play a musical instrument because she feels the discipline and experience train one in a certain mode of thinking and clarity about problem solving. She feels that she accomplished this with the older boys and particularly with Dave and Nicholas, but by the time Evelyn came along she was bored with the routines she had to maintain in order to enforce their

continuous work. She thinks that part of the difficulty with Bruce was that she was his teacher and he was her first student, She thinks there are problems with changing roles from mother to teacher, but this was particularly difficult for her when she first began to teach. She didn't teach her children again until recently with Roger. Lea and Jim see themselves as encouraging the children to be independent and achieve academically. They also want them to have a special area of competence in which they feel strongly interested, although they don't see this as having to lead to a career. They are concerned that the children should be able to think clearly and problem-solve in difficult situations and find this is most difficult with Bruce and Roger. Lea states that she makes an active effort to spend time with Roger which she does through both music and reading, Jim sees himself as having the most contact with the older boys because of their shared interests. Lea has a warm and easy relationship with Evelyn, although she comments somewhat critically about her daughter's flirtatiousness and lack of discipline. The bulk of parental interests and attention appear most frequently focused on "the big boys," and Evelyn and Roger often seem left out. Jim states that he doesn't have as high expectations fo achievement for Evelyn, and expects her, more than the boys, to focus on relationships. Lea disagreed with this goal, yet at the same time she admits she doesn't see Evelyn as intellectually capable as the boys.

The family's patterns of identification can be traced to some extent through the clear family metaphors of music for Lea and teaching, writing and sports for Jim. The children are strongly, androgynously identified, and their conflicts of interest in scheduling may stand for

their inability to decide between maternal and paternal demands, both of which are high. Lea and Jim are both concerned about being too demanding, at the same time that they feel it is important to make demands in order to help the children mature as competent adults.

Summary of Sex-role Themes

The Hurleys are a couple with traditional work allocation who have a traditionally sex-typed presentation of their relationship and androgynous patterns underlying this. Jim is the patriarchal head of the household, while Lea is the strong and competent manager behind the scene. She runs their complex household efficiently, and until recently has included in her responsibilities the task of insulating Jim from their family life so he would be free to work. Lea and Jim seem to be replicating the marital relationships in both their families of origin. In these couples, a strong and intelligent woman chose to give up career possibilities and worked at managing the household and protecting her husband from stress so that he was free to work. Underlying this traditional patriarchal pattern is the woman's strength and dominance and the man's dependence.

Lea felt most identified with and closer to her mother, yet her admiration for her father and attempts to be closer to him have also involved an identification which has been a central influence in her life. She chose music as her work in her identification with her father, and also identifies with him emotionally and temperamentally. Jim felt closest to his mother as he was growing up, and feels emotionally tied to her while mistrusting her need to control the family. His work choice is

related to his identification with his father, in that he seems to have chosen a career which would preclude his father's stressful and self-destructive experience with business. At the same time Jim is experiencing a crisis in his work related in part to his lack of financial success.

The Hurley children illustrate the powerful influence of the sibling constellation both in the impact of sibling relationships on the individual child and the importance of parental views in differentiating members of the sibling set. All the Hurley children show an androgynous outcome of their mother's musical demands and their father's intellectual and athletic demands. On the other hand, the children see their mother as emotional and their father as rational, and differentiate between men and women along that dimension. Bruce Hurley, 18, has androgynous interests and characteristics, but describes track as a masculine interest--a necessary protection from the derision of peers who see his intellectuality and artistic interests as feminine. Bruce is going through an intense adolescent identity crisis which he experiences in terms of the need to break away from his parents and the difficulty of accomplishing this. His dilemma seems exacerbated by his parents' high level and sometimes conflicting demands to achieve. David, 17, seems the most closely identified with his father's intellectuality and interest in philosophy, although he feels closer to his mother because of their greater contact. Nicholas, 16, describes his "external" self as more like his father and his "internal" self as more like his mother. David and Nicholas are close, and seem to be more outside the strong parental relationships than their three siblings.

The parental grouping of the three "big boys" has accentuated the age difference between them and their younger siblings, so that Evelyn, 14, and Roger, 11, are linked as a younger sibling subset by a number of forces. Evelyn is replicating her mother's relationship with her parents in feeling closest to her mother while identifying with characteristics of her father so as to become closer to him. She feels unable to compete with her brothers intellectually and athletically, and has turned to a seductive, emotional feminine role as an area of specialness. At the same time, she has been influenced by the women's movement and her discussion of feminism and sex differences during the interview was complex and sophisticated. Roger seems strongly affected by his position as the youngest in this powerful sibling group, and his emotional outbursts indicate the stress of his place in the family. His interests and characteristics are highly androgynous and diverse: he achieves in sports, art, school, is popular with friends, and seems to be covering all the areas of parental demand.

The sibling constellation seems to some extent a duplicate of Lea's sibling constellation in her family of origin. In both her past and present families, the oldest child was an emotional "casualty" of parental conflict and demands which could not be met. There was clear differentiation between the sexes, and Lea is following her father's pattern of focusing higher level demands and attention on her sons.

The Martin Family

Nancy, 33, and Steve, 36, have been married for fourteen years and have three children, Danny and Tommy, thirteen-year-old twins, and Irene, twelve. They met in their hometown in New Jersey when both were freshmen at the state university, and married a year and a half later in 1962. Steve works full time as an academic counselor in a small program within a university and is finishing his dissertation. Nancy has full household and childcare responsibilities, does part-time secretarial work and works part-time as a teacher's aide in an elementary school. The Martins are a stable family in an extensive network which includes many transient and unfamilied friends, and their home has the air of a well-travelled, casually welcoming and somewhat chaotic space. Both Steve and Nancy have very busy schedules which infrequently connect, and the choreography of their work and family responsibilities takes place at a frenetic pace.

Nancy Martin

Nancy is a shy and soft-spoken woman who hesitates to state her opinions, but comes across as articulate and sensitive when she does assert her views. She seems uncertain that her perceptions are of value or interest to others, in spite of her apparent intelligence and verbal competence. Nancy is strongly committed to parenting, and in the past has worked out of financial need rather than interest. She became pregnant shortly after their marriage, and continued to take occasional courses, finishing her B.A. in 1972 after twelve years. She worked full time as a housewife and mother until the family moved to this area in 1969, then

did part-time secretarial work. She tried full time secretarial work at one point but found the hours too inflexible, then worked full-time last year when she was offered a job with a more flexible schedule. She now spends three mornings a week in her job at the elementary school and does a substantial amount of typing at home.

Personal history. Nancy was born in an industrial city in New Jersey, and had two older brothers and a brother nine years younger. He father was the resident doctor for a large local company, had polio as a young man and spent a great deal of time at home. Her mother was a strong and competent woman who dropped out of nursing school to get married, and devoted all her energy to taking care of household, husband and children. Nancy describes her parents' relationship as a "model marriage." She states that her mother always took a subordinate position in relation to her father, but he was completely dependent on her. Nancy states that she was closer to and felt most identified with her mother, whom she admired tremendously and saw as an ideal figure. She describes her mother as a beautiful and unique woman, the great earthmother who took care of everything for everybody. Her father was the intellectual in the family, prized academic achievement highly, was very interested in languages and linguistics. His favorite was the oldest son, the family's "golden boy" who was handsome, bright and athletic. Her mother's favorite was the youngest son, and the two of them had the warmest relationship in an otherwise undemonstrative family. Nancy felt she was special to her parents as the only girl. She saw the middle brother as left with the least family connection, could never compete with his siblings and had the most troubled childhood. Nancy states that she achieved academically in rela-

tion to her father's expectations. She did well in school and it was expected that she would attend college,

Nancy described herself as a shy, chubby child and miserable adolescent who attempted to gain acceptance from her peers by being defiant. She became sexually active in high school with lower class boyfriends with whom she would sneak weeknight dates. She doesn't link her difficult adolescence to the fact that she lacked a central position in relation to either parent. Her choice of sexual sphere as a means of becoming close to her parents is consistent with their emphasis that she was their only daughter and this was her special role in the family. Nancy met Steve during her freshman year in college when both were living at home and were riding to school in the same carpool,

Steve Martin

Steve is a confident, assertive, outspoken man who enjoys a good political discussion and waxes passionate and eloquent on a wide range of liberal issues. He works as an academic counselor in a university until he finishes his dissertation. He is accomplished at grantsmanship, and helps an assortment of public service and welfare agencies write grant applications and program proposals. His work, school and political activities fully absorb his time, although he is beginning to wind down some of these commitments in order to spend more time with the family.

Personal history. Steve came from a lower middle class family in New Jersey, had a brother one year older and a sister four years younger. His father was a Spanish immigrant who owned a small grocery store. His mother was of Scottish ancestry, a strong and competent woman who was

responsible for the household and children, She worked with her husband in his business and clearly yielded to his authority as head of the house. Steve describes his father as absorbed in his work, and they began a closer relationship as Steve began to work in the family business after school. His mother was the major disciplinarian although his father was the ultimate authority whose word was law. The two brothers were close and essentially independent. Steve and his brother were in the same grade at school, spent a great deal of the time together carousing around the city in spite of their basically different interests. Steve described his brother as a "greaser" and a gambler, didn't do well in school and had failed a grade, and they were called "spic and span" by their classmates. His father was disturbed by his older brother's ppor academic performance, was closest to his sister whom he protected with the traditional Spanish double standard. His mother was also closest to his sister, although she divided resources equally among them. Steve feels very identified with his father at this point in his life, both in relation to his family and in his approach to work.

Steve was a poor student until his senior year and failed a number of subjects, yet the family always recognized him as very bright and intellectually capable. He worked hard his senior year and got into college as a business major, then dropped out of college because he wasn't interested in continuing in business. Steve began to work for a large company as a laborer, was at that point very influenced by two ministers who introduced him to an intellectual life and encouraged him to return to school. He began again as a freshman two years later, and was involved with one girl from his high school crowd for four years, but broke off

the relationship when he returned to college and met Nancy that same year.

Couple's Relationship

Nancy and Steve were both living at home and commuting to the university when they met, and both were returning to college for the second time although from very different experiences. Steve had just gone through an intellectual awakening, and was very focused on his schoolwork and contacts with a different "class" of people. For him, Nancy was part of those upper classes, the doctor's daughter who grew up with classical music in her home. Nancy had no particular career interests, and saw Steve as a relationship her family approved of. She became pregnant shortly after the marriage, and the couple lived with her parents during the last month of her pregnancy and the first few months after the twins were born. The children's birth was a new and important element in Nancy's relationship with her mother. As she speaks of this time it seems that she was absorbed with family life and the positive identity it provided her after a painful adolescence. Steve was deeply absorbed in his schoolwork and his full-time job and was a distant member of the household. Their family and home became a center for a politically liberal group of students, and both describe this period as busy, exciting and chaotic. From the beginning, the marriage served needs for both Nancy and Steve which were more centrally related to other spheres of their life than to their relationship as a couple. Steve is dominant in the relationship, Nancy feels insecure and intellectually inferior to him. He has been encouraging her pursuit of her own work and independent ac-

tivities, and she has been encouraging his greater involvement with the family.

Danny Martin

Danny is thirteen years old and in 8th grade, the older of the twins by five minutes. He is the more physically frail of the two, was born with a physical disability which required corrective surgery in infancy. He is an intelligent, witty, tightly wound boy who speaks in short, crisp sentences. He builds complicated models which include cars, horror film characters, prehistoric scenarios, and star-trek ships. Danny watches television and reads comic books avidly, several years ago created a comic book and wrote 70 issues for it. He taught himself how to play the piano, and particularly likes Scot Joplin rags. Danny is small for his age and not athletic, and as a result gets bullied by gangs of more aggressive boys in school. He is not very sociable with peers, has a small group of friends at school and is generally favored and appreciated by adults. Danny does well in school, is taking several subjects at an upper level, but this year was skipping one of his classes because there was a tough group in it that he wanted to avoid. Danny described himself as closer to his mother because she spends more time with him, admires and respects his father and would like to spend more time with him. He stated that this age is a difficult time for boys because they develop more slowly than girls and because boys pick on each other, although he prefers being a boy and assumes that girls have their own hassles that he doesn't know about. He's not sure what he'd like to do in the future, but fantasized that he would like to explore other

planets.

Tommy Martin

Tommy is the more athletic and sociable of the twins, is talkative and charming and was relaxed during the interview. He builds model airplances, cars, and war tanks, is very interested in war stories and reads a great deal of historical and fictional war books. He is an aggressive and competitive game player who always wins and has trouble luring his brother and sister into a game as a result. Tommy makes friends easily with peers, and isn't under attack from more aggressive boys in the ways Danny is. He describes himself as closer to his mother because she spends more time with them and helps get them organized. Tommy does well in school, and because he doesn't suffer over the same issues with peers he enjoys it more than Danny does. He sees boys and girls as very different in their interests. He thinks girls don't take things as seriously as boys and don't understand game strategies as well, although he sees them as equally smart and feels sex differences are socialized. He talked at length about a friend who is a tomboy and "might as well be a boy" with admiration at her ability to be in both the male and the female worlds. Tommy expects that he wil go to a good college, but doesn't know what he will be doing after that.

Irene Martin

Irene is 12 years old and in 7th grade, is bright and easily articulate. She presented herself with self-conscious and serious maturity during the interview while showing glimpses of the somewhat petulant and

temperamental child beneath the surface. She is deeply absorbed in social relationships as both enthusiastic participant and skeptical observer of the social demands around her. She is concerned about her appearance and popularity and has begun attending school dances with her friends. She has a friend sleep at her house every weekend, and they stay up half the night discussing an assortment of subjects including the social scenario of the junior high school. Irene does well in school, particularly in Spanish, is having some trouble with math and complained that she doesn't get enough help with it at home. She is presently involved in redecorating her room and moving out her large collection of dolls into the basement. Irene goes to bed late every night, likes to stay up and listen to music. She said that she could handle staying up late whereas her brothers can't. Irene described herself as closer to her mother because she has more contact with her: she's there after school with them and comes up and says goodnight to her every night before she goes to sleep. Irene resents the fact that her brothers always form a coalition aginst her during arguments. She feels they pick on her because she's a girl and describes them as chauvinistic. Irene sees the differences between men and women as related to their stereotyped family roles, which she doesn't think are fair; she complains about the rigid dress expectations for girls. She described boys as meaner and girls as colder. Irene expects that in the future she will be married and have many animals. She will probably have a job--such as a doctor or with the Peace Corps--in which she can be helping people.

Sibling Relationship

Danny and Tommy have a close relationship and share many interests, although they often fight over possessions. Tommy is generally the "chaser" and Danny the "chasee" in these fights. The two brothers often team up against Irene, who has been trying to catch up to her older brothers since they began school. Danny and Tommy ridicule her for her level at school and tell her they learned how to do what she is working on ages ago, which infuriates her. The three of them fight over resources, toys and time with the television set.

Family History

Nancy and Steve married in early 1962, and had the twins by the end of that year. They were surprised at the birth of twins, and Nancy felt overwhelmed by the demands of parenting. She described her mother as tremendously helpful during their early infancy. Irene was born early in 1964, and again the family moved in with Nancy's parents for a month around her birth. During their five years in their hometown in New Jersey, Steve went to school and worked for an industrial company beginning as a laborer and moving into a management training program. Nancy was taking part-time courses, and both shared politically liberal interests. In 1967, Steve decided he wanted to be doing public service work. He joined the teacher core and enrolled in a master's degree program in Worcester that offered him a comfortable stipend. Nancy was reluctant to make the move because she wanted to remain close to her family, and for a few months Steve lived in Worcester and came home on weekends before the family moved. In 1969, they moved to this area when Steve enrolled in a

doctoral program. For a few years he held university teaching and research positions, and Nancy began her part-time secretarial work at that point. In 1973 Steve began his present job and they bought their first house. At this point Steve is finishing his Ph.D. and looking around for a job, although they will attempt to stay in this community while the children are still in school.

Division of Labor and the Meaning of Work

Throughout the history of their relationship, Nancy has had exclusive responsibility for household and childcare and Steve has remained completely focused on his schoolwork and career development as well as his active participation with political groups. Most of their possessions are in Nancy's name so that Steve wouldn't have to be involved with the paperwork. Nancy feels overextended by the demands of the household and children as well as her two part-time jobs, and is trying to involve the children in more of the housework. Her demands of Steve are that he become more involved in family life and his relationship with the children rather than to take on household responsibilities. She stated that although he's willing to help with a task if he's asked, she resents that she has to take the initiative and he doesn't take more responsibility on his own.

Nancy is very focused on her family roles, and particularly her responsibilities as a parent, and sees work as an adjunct to that. She feels that she would like to be doing something which is financially productive, and thinks this will be essential as the children approach time to go to college. She also spoke of the need to work in terms of Steve's

intellectual and career development and his respect for work and achievement. She said she feels like an outsider in his professional circles, and this is part of the energy which is feeding her interest in teaching. Nancy describes herself as lacking a work ethic, and feeling insecure in the work of work and afraid of failing. At the same time, she has clearly handled her work very competently, and her last secretarial job involved editing and organizational responsibilities. The source of Nancy's insecurity in the world of work seems to come from her message in her family of origin that she could not compete as an intellectual, and her special place in the family was as woman and daughter.

Steve sees himself as closely identified with his father's work ethic and high level of commitment to work. He is competent and ambitious, and defines himself most centrally in terms of his work. He began his interest in teaching with an interest in working class and Puerto Rican migrant communities and has done a great deal of his work with social service agencies. More recently he has begun to feel that the most important level of impact is an individual one, and sees his work counseling students in this context. After he finishes his doctoral work, he will be looking for work in this area and would like to get an administrative position within a university.

Parenting and Parent-child Relationships

Until recently, Nancy has been exclusively involved in parenting and discipline and Steve has been distant except for discipline of the moment. Issues of parenting are their greatest area of conflict: Nancy sees Steve as overly distant and uninvolved and too strict and reactive

when he is involved. Steve sees Nancy as excessively overinvolved with the children, and too permissive and willing to compromise in their squabbles. She tends to attempt diplomatic resolutions and compromises, whereas he tends to deliver authoritarian statements which will close the argument. As the children are becoming older, Steve feels more comfortable and interested in being with them. He is beginning to participate more in family activities although Nancy remains instrumental in organizing these. Nancy feels they have done the children a disservice in having modeled very traditionally sex-typed family roles, and would like to offer the children more flexible possibilities for their own future. Both are conscious of sex-role issues: Nancy has been encouraging the boys to cook and Steve tells Irene she's going to be a doctor, not a nurse.

Although Nancy and Steve feel they have similar expectations for achievement for all the children, they feel more protective of Irene and are more concerned about her entry into sexuality. For both parents, this fear is rooted in both cultural expectations and in their family of origin experience. Nancy seems to identify her own sexually active adolescence with Irene, and talked about anticipating trouble with Irene's adolescence. Steve's family protected his younger sister in relation to sex, and he links this to his own protective stance towards Irene. Nancy appears to actively favor the boys, especially Tommy who coincidentally bears the name of her favored oldest brother. Steve responds to Irene's femininity as his father did to his sister. These patterns of identification may in part account for Irene's active turning to feminine sexuality as she approaches adolescence, and for Tommy's position as the more

secure of the two boys.

Summary of Sex-role Themes

The Martins are a couple with a traditional work allocation who are politically liberal while having traditionally sex-typed characters and marital relationship. Nancy has focused on her parenting role almost to the exclusion of their marital relationship, and has worked only out of financial necessity. Her insecurity about her abilities and competence in a work role is related to her inability to compete intellectually with her older brother in her family or origin. Her focus on parenting emerges from her strong identification with her mother, whom she saw as an idealized "earthmother." She learned that the traditionally feminine role was her only means of being in a special place in relation to her family. Steve is most centrally work focused to the exclusion of his family relalationships; this pattern relates to his strong identification with his immigrant, work-focused father. This couple's difference in most satisfying role has been a source of conflict in the Martin's marital relationship. Both Nancy and Steve believe the feminist movement has affected their parenting roles, and they are encouraging their children to see family roles as more flexible than those they model in their family. Although both Nancy and Steve are changing their work roles in a less traditional direction, they see this as related to their personal and family development rather than to the impact of feminism. Nancy plans to begin full-time teaching, because it is a work role which she can integrate into her family life. She feels unsure of herself, but finds it necessary to work because of financial pressure of approaching college costs.

Steve states that he wasn't interested in the children when they were younger, but now that they are older he can relate to them more as individuals and share a more meaningful relationship with them. He is also coming to the end of his long career training with the end of his dissertation, and seems to be finishing his student stage by winding down his outside commitments.

Danny and Tommy, ages 13, are strongly paired by their parents and feel closely connected to each other, while at the same time being different enough in personal characteristics to have developed different areas of interest. Danny is the weaker and the more androgynous of the two, while Tommy has masculine sex-typed activities, The difference in size and temperament between the twins has most likely been accentuated by the differential ways they are perceived by their parents, Nancy most markedly. Irene, age 12, is feminine in many of her interests and activities and has androgynous characteristics. She is close to and identified with her mother. She is strongly competitive with her older brothers, and her feminine interests seem to be a way to carve out an area of competence in which they don't have a developmental edge. In this way, she is replicating Nancy's use of femininity as her special place in her family of origin, Nancy is replicating the pattern in her family of origin of valuing the boys over the girl, and seems to have further identified Tommy with her favored older brother whose name he shares. Tommy and Nancy are linked by their interest in the French language, which is her ethnic background. Danny and Irene are studying Spanish, which is their father's ethnic bakcground and a link with him, Both parents are replicating patterns from their families of origin in their relationship

to Irene, particularly as she approaches sexual adolescence. Nancy identifies Irene's adolescence with her own sexual acting out in adolescence without differentiating herself from Irene. Steve identifies with his father's sexual protectiveness of his younger sister.

CHAPTER IV

CASE STUDIES OF NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES

The Thomas Family

Sara, 48, and William, 44, have been married for 15 years and have two children, Paul, 13, and Saraellen, 12. They met in 1958 at the Boston Unitarian Church, where Sara was working and Willian was living while in graduate school in art, and married in 1960. Sara works full time as an administrator in a small college and William is a househusband and sculptor. Although they pursue their individual work and interests rather independently, they share a strong commitment to their family life and are structuring in activities as a couple. Their household reflects the flexible and sometimes chaotic integration of their diverse pursuits.

Sara Thomas

Sara is a deep-voiced, assertive woman who appeared serious and solidly grounded from the beginning of the interviews. She has been working full-time and supporting the family financially since their move to this area two years ago. She had stopped working full time during her first pregnancy in 1962, and after that worked full-time as a housewife and mother holding occasional part-time jobs. The realization that she needed to return to work, and the decision to make that step in spite of her age, has given her life exciting focus and direction at the same time that it has been demanding and disequilibrating. At this point, the demands of her new work are the focus of her energy and attention, although

she is interested in writing, is in a non-residential graduate program, and is taking a women's studies course. Sara is physically active, does yoga and a number of outdoor activities.

Personal history. Sara and her family grew up in a wealthy suburb of Chicago, always struggling and not quite making it into the upper class which had been her paternal grandparents' socioeconomic status. Her grandfather was a respected judge, and her father was regarded as a failure by his wife and family because he did not succeed in maintaining that life-style and financial stature, although he constantly attempted to in his work as a businessman and investor. Sara's mother was a physical education teacher who gave up her career when she married. She describes her father as a mild and generous man who was "beside himself" in moments of anger, which she attributes to his frustrations with work. He was very active in community activities and Sara thinks he would have been happy in a social service profession. Her mother took parenting very seriously, but was constantly battling for her "compulsive" neatness. Both parents were very strict with their children, and Sara recalls that they did not tolerate noise, defiance, or expression of negative emotions. She describes herself as feeling close to neither parent, although she now sees herself as having been undifferentiated from her mother and "symbiotically" attached to her. She states that during childhood through early adulthood she experienced some of her mother's emotions, including depression. She felt she had a good "joking" relationship with her father, but he didn't open up emotionally.

Sara was closest both positively and negatively to her older sister, whom she tagged along after and tried to model in spite of their

temperamental differences and her sister's rejection. She describes her sister as a bully, athletic, bold, always experimenting and pushing limits. Sara saw her younger siblings, a sister three years younger and a brother four years younger, as part of another distinct sibling set and had little to do with them except in their contact as a family. Her one warm experience of her family comes from their frequent, sometimes formalized family activities. They had dinner by candlelight nightly, shared an active interest in outdoor and athletic activities, were religious and had contact with both her father's Presbyterian and her mother's Unitarian faith.

Sara describes herself as having been the top student in her classes as a child, and she always had a lot of friends in elementary school. In contrast, her adolescence was very painful and she feels she had a difficult time growing up. She felt awkward about her physical development and was teased by her mother which made her feel worse. Sara had conflict with her teachers which she attributes to her intellectual maturity combined with social immaturity. She is resentful that neither her teachers nor her parents were sensitive to her problems at a point when she felt unable to discuss them with anyone.

Sara when to Smith College because it had been her mother's school. She was unhappy there, and did not perform well academically. She could not find enough faculty members to pursue her interest in biblical studies, and graduated with a degree in English literature. Although she dated and had devoted boyfriends, she felt "out of phase" and uninvolved with boys her age, had her closest relationships with girlfriends. She decided on teaching without great interest or commitment to it. She went

to teach in a private school in the midwest, and failed miserably at the job. After a few years of teaching, she entered graduate school in religious education at Princeton, and was 26 when she began a three-year M.A. program. She regrets not having continued for a Ph.D. at a time when it would have been relatively easy to finish the work. At that time, neither she nor the people she was working with considered that a viable option for her. She still had difficulty with her romantic relationships, and as a result of an unhappy and complicated love affair decided to enter a long-term psychoanalysis. Sara remained in the New Jersey area a year and a half after she received her degree in order to finish the therapy. She says that during that time she finally severed her too-close ties to her parents and became aware of the dependent relationship between her and her mother.

Although she had always expected to marry, Sara had been worried about her patterns of involvement with men. She had taken the analytic vow not to take any major life steps until she terminated therapy, which she did at the age of 31. At that point she was engaged to be married, but broke off the engagement less than a year later. She took a job as educational director at the Unitarian house in Boston, Massachusetts, where she met William.

William Thomas

William appears gentle and sensitive, reticent initially, but quite articulate in communicating about his experience. He gave up his full-time work as an art teacher in a small Vermont college to focus on his own sculpting. At the same time he took on full responsibility for

housework and childcare, a move which he and Sara discussed and coordinating in meeting the individual needs of both. William also pursues an active interest in music, plays the recorder and formed an Amherst recorder society. He is finding adjustment of this new arrangement somewhat difficult, misses the structure and contact of teaching and during the time of the interviews was talking about applying for a part-time teaching job at a local school. William began the teaching job a few months after the interviews.

Personal history. William grew up in a small, wealthy town in New York. His mother died when he was two, leaving him and his two older sisters with their father until his remarriage three years later. His father never spoke about his mother which William attributes to guilt about her death caused by an illness brought on by overwork. She remained a mythical figure, but William was able to find out more about her from her diaries and other writings he found in the house years later. She was artistic and creative, ambivalent about settling down and having children, highly energetic and emotional. His father has said that although they were deeply in love he doesn't know how he could have gotten along with her in a marriage because of their temperamental differences. William described his father as moralistic, disciplined, and well-organized, an energetic and successful leader with a strong Puritan work ethic. He was trained at Harvard as an engineer, but valued classics and a scholarly education. William feels his father didn't do what he wanted with his work. The family was upper class both socially and financially, although they were also taught to be economical and work for things in consonance with their strict work ethic.

William's father remarried a "hausfrau", a competent householder who was not as intelligent as her husband and always took a subservient position in their relationship. William thinks his father was bored by his stepmother, and although they seldom fought openly he recalls his father disrupting the dinner schedule in passive aggressive ways. William experienced her as cold and distant, and she was much more connected with the son from their marriage who was 10 years younger. He and his father had a negatively charged relationship, and William resented having to live up to his father's rigorous demands and expectations. Although he was demanding of all his children, he expected William as the oldest son to be more competent and achievement-motivated than his older sisters. William speaks of his father with still fresh anger and resentment. He felt that he was being asked to be as competent as his father and was doomed to failure.

William had a close, warm relationship with both older sisters, who teased, cuddled and babied him. He thinks their parents placed unrealistic demands on his sisters to succeed socially and were constantly critical of their "lower breed" boyfriends. He believes the younger of the two was most adversely affected by this and describes her as insecure and lonely in contrast to the oldest who was socially outgoing and attractive. Rules were enforced by silent disapproval rather than physical punishment, and demands were explicit and expected to be met. There were strong family rituals and traditions, including formal dinners, weekend and holiday social and religious activities, and annual gatherings of the "clan" in their New Hampshire summer home.

William was shy and awkwardly self-conscious as a child and adoles-

cent, had few friends, and did little dating. He was bored by school, didn't work at it, didn't do very well and watched the clock in all but his art classes. Although he was very good at drawing and carving, he didn't decide to pursue art as a career until years after college. His father encouraged his interest in art, which William believes was related to his father's feelings toward his mother. In high school he became interested in zoology and worked collecting small mammals for the New York Museum of Science. He went to college at Brown because a cousin helped him get in, and found its program ideal for him. He became more interested in applied zoology, especially ecology and wildlife. After graduating from college he went to the University of Virginia where he got master's degrees in both geography and wildlife. He finished his graduate work when he was 26, was drafted into the Army shortly after and was enlisted as a modified conscientious objector. Because of his educational background which included fluency in several languages, he was placed in a Massachusetts research unit where he studied manuscripts on Greenland in Danish. His work in the Army gave William the opportunity to reconsider his career choice, and at this point he realized his strongest interest was in art. He decided to get an early dismissal from the Army and return to graduate school, which he did in the fall of 1958. He began graduate school at Boston University for an M.F.A. in art, and lived in the Unitarian church where he met Sara.

Couple's Relationship

Sara and William chose to marry on the basis of shared interests and philosophy, and they show striking similarity in their personal de-

velopment as well. Both came to the marriage with a history of unsatisfying social relationships, both had made career changes in their professional development, both were angry and resentful of their parents and family experience. They also shared an interest in nature, books, music, religion, and a strong sense of family tradition and ritual. Both had put marriage off while they worked on growing up in other ways, and at the time of their marriage they both felt ready to settle into more traditional roles.

Although both speak of the importance of their relationship, it is as a stable base towards the pursuit of work and family life rather than as central in its own right. During the first years of their marriage they became increasingly distant in the pursuit of their own activities and responsibilities, Sara as a mother and housewife, William as an art teacher. Both became increasingly unhappy with the situation while remaining in it, to a point where the impetus for change was of crisis proportion. Only when Sara was briefly hospitalized did they begin to discuss and negotiate the need to change their work and parenting roles in order to better meet their individual needs. As part of the work on their relationship, they joined a couple's marriage enrichment group in Vermont and formed one when they came to this area.

When they were first married, William described himself as overly dependent on Sara. He thinks that has changed since they changed their work arrangements. Sara states that the opposite is true for her, and that she has become more dependent on William more recently. They are referring here to dependence on care and emotional support, Financial dependence is another issue with its own history and place in the rela-

tionship. Although the pattern in their relationship closest to view is the role-reversed one of her dominance and his acquiescence, it is clear that both have another side to their personalities which is an element in their relationship as well. Their relationship in the present has been strongly affected by their changes in work, and they are involved in a series of shifting moves towards equilibrium which are at times mutually supportive and at times at odds.

Paul Thomas

Paul is 13 years old and in 8th grade, a strikingly intelligent and verbally articulate boy on the verge of puberty. He is tall and broad, carries himself with some awkward self-consciousness. His speech has a ring which has traces of anger, defiance, and childish petulance. His vocabulary is enormous and he often pauses in mid-air to form a more elaborated sentence than would emerge spontaneously. He has diverse interests which include art, electric trains, folkdancing, reading, and drums. He is sensitive and non-aggressive, prefers activities alone, both of which are issues of conflict for him with more aggressive peers at school who bully him and call him "faggot." Paul is part of a group of boys at school who share similar interests and are similarly bullied, but describes himself as feeling essentially isolated, He sees himself as weak and helpless in the face of bullies at school, although they tend to leave him alone because of his size and are more likely to abuse his smaller friends. He is mature, orderly, and responsible about tasks, does very well in school and is taking several courses at the high school. He hates the junior high, contrasts it with the intimacy and protection

of his elementary schools, is very resentful of the move which brought them to this area and this junior high school. As an intelligent, sensitive, non-athletic boy, he is facing adolescence with some trepidation as he becomes aware of the kind of gauntlet he will be forced to run in junior high school. He feels girls have an easier time because they don't face the same aggressiveness from same-sex peers. Although he's not sure what kind of work he'll be doing in the future, he thinks he would like to be an architect or designer.

Saraellen Thomas

Saraellen is 12 years old and in 7th grade, is equally intelligent and articulate, but more assertive and confident in her presentation of self than is Paul. She has not begun to menstruate, but is beginning to show the air of physical changes that are approaching with puberty. Because of her greater self-confidence, she is consistently the winner of verbal jousting with Paul; she is puzzled by this state of affairs and doesn't know why Paul succumbs to her arguments so easily. She is acutely aware of social rankings and relationships, very involved with her group of friends at school, and frequently sees tasks in terms of their relationship components. She likes her science class because a lot of her friends are in it, she chose trumpet as an instrument and gave up piano because piano is more solitary whereas with trumpet you can join a band. She writes fiction and composes descriptive narratives in the middles of conversations, is interested in drama, and reads a great deal. Saraellen is an observer of social relationships including those in her family, and she gave me more information about interactions than anyone

else. Her manner of speech also contains the mixture of anger and childishness which characterized Paul and can sometimes be heard in Sara and William's voices. She is at present very involved in decorating her room, and is taking great pleasure in changing her personal space. She talks disdainfully about girls who are involved in feminine dressing up and romances, at the same time that she wishes to be accepted by her peers and feels marginal in the junior high world of popularity rankings. Her ideal for the future would be to live on a farm and do a lot of writing.

Sibling Relationship

Paul and Saraellen are both close friends and arch competitors for parental attention. As part of their developmental stage, they show a mix of the childish possessive wishes and adolescent distance and need for privacy. They share a complex fantasy game which involves both their large collections of stuffed animals. They seem to turn to each other for companionship frequently, although Saraellen is leaving Paul behind and going off with friends more frequently.

Family History

The patterns of decision-making in determining the time and place of geographical moves reflect the changes in work arrangements. While William was supporting the family financially, moves were determined on the basis of his work and academic schedule, and this changed when Sara became the "breadwinner." Their first move was from Boston to Vermont in the fall of 1963, where William began work as an art teacher at a small

college. Paul, born in 1962, was a year old and Saraellen, born in 1963, was an infant at the time of the move. Sara describes this as a difficult time, in part because of the need to adjust to an isolated rural community with two young children. Saraellen had been born with a heart defect which required corrective surgery, and she went through critical illnesses during her first year of life. They remained based in Vermont until 1973, although they left the area in spring of 1967 when William taught at an all-black school in the South and in the fall of 1969 when they spent William's sabbatical year at a midwestern university. Soon after their return they began discussing the need to change their work situations, and when they left for France in the fall of 1973 where William was working in a teaching exchange Sara had made job applications. In the spring of 1974 Sara received the offer for her present job, and they relocated from Vermont upon their return from France. Sara disliked Vermont because of the isolation and because it was difficult for her to find a job close enough to home that she could take care of the children. At this point, the rest of the family is finding the move difficult and attributes the change in part to the suburban quality of the area. Paul and William in particular find it less desirable than Vermont.

Division of Labor and the Meaning of Work

The material in the interviews with the Thomas family is strongly influenced by the recent transition in work arrangements. Questions about division of labor and the meaning of work hit close to the center of change, and make more clearly visible some of the dynamics in the process of transition. Both Sara and William comment on how much easier the

change had been in the planning than in its actual, mundane, daily execution. This difficulty seems to stem both from underestimating the amount of work and the necessary skills involved, and from the insecurity and self-doubt involved in stepping out of their own familiar if uncomfortable roles. As part of their attempts to stabilize in their new roles, they were trying to attain a sense of competence which was doomed to become a competitive struggle by the additional fact that one's new role was the other's old one.

At this point, William is responsible for household and childcare and is finding adjustment a slower and more demanding process than he had expected. The role of household responsibility carries with it an experience of self which transcends the sex of its performer, and William speaks quite clearly about that experience, in part because he is able to contrast it with his previous work. He found it particularly difficult to lose the financial rewards, social contacts, and feedback from peers he received from his teaching job. He is forced to turn to his identity as an artist for his self esteem, yet that too is an insecure identity at this point. In this context, he talks about how important it has become to get out of the house in the evenings and pursue other activities in which he has contact with people. William dislikes seeing himself as atypical, and talks about the reasonableness of this kind of lifestyle for an artist. He doesn't see that what they're doing as a family is a "revolutionary transformation of the American family system or something, it's just a natural logical thing to do." Because he still needs work as a central part of his definition of self, he looks to his work as an artist and to the artist's unconventional life-style for a model. In this

context, he mentioned that the artist Joan Miro had done his painting while taking care of his family. William admits that this transition remains difficult given that he is not succeeding in selling much artwork, and he sees it as highly probable that he will return to teaching part-time in order to have access to more structured and financially secure work.

Sara's transition to the high-pressure position of full time work has also been a painful one. Her part-time work during her marriage was unsatisfying, largely because she remained in child education. At one point she ran a nursery school from their home, but the choice was made by the circumstances of geography and family responsibility rather than interest. Her turning point with work began during their year in the midwest which was the first year both of the children were in school. She described this as the happiest year of her married life in that she had a job she liked, began graduate school, and began to work in non-traditional education. At the point when they came back to Vermont she was briefly hospitalized and realized that she had to make a work life for herself there. Although she describes this time as terribly painful, out of that crisis she moved to organize an educational program which received government funding. Sara feels that her contact with the feminist movement was an important source of support for her decision to return to work. In spite of her increasing feeling of competence and well-being in relation to work, the move to this area and the pressure of full-time work have proven difficult. At present her job is the family's only source of income, which she feels increases the pressure and demands for success. In the spring of the first year she entered

short-term psychotherapy, and feels this was an important source of support in seeing her through the adjustment period. At this point she feels she has made it through the most difficult period, and like William is seeing more flexible possibilities for the future. She is likely to return to graduate school for her doctorate at some point, and although she would prefer to stay in this area until the children finish school, she sees it as likely that they will be moving around geographically at that point.

A sudden and dramatic reversal of roles was Sara and William's vehicle towards changing work roles that both found unsatisfying, but it was the radical nature of their move which made the transition as difficult as it was. At this point they see themselves as moving towards greater flexibility, and see as their ideal a point at which both would be holding part-time jobs and neither would have the full pressure of one role or the other.

Parenting and Parent-child Relationships

Sara and William take family life and their relationship to their children as a serious focus for their lives. William in particular talks about how much fun their relationship to Paul and Saraellen has been. They have brought the traditions and rituals from both their families into the present, including a nightly dinner with candlelight and grace. They are a physically close and affectionate family, and share an interest in outdoor activities. Sara and William's style of discipline is to discuss their demands and negotiate them, which at this point primarily involves household chores. Rivalry between the children is another im-

portant issue which they at times attempt to negotiate. They try to encourage the development of assertiveness and creativity in both the children, although when William talks about teaching them to take control over their environment it is clear that he has Paul's school situation in mind. Sara describes herself as needing to know about her children's experience, which brings her in greatest conflict with Paul. She is worried about his school situation and attempts to talk to him about it, has made contact with his teachers and is highly emotionally involved in spite of Paul's protests. William sees this as a passing phase and identifies it with his own shyness and awkwardness as an adolescent, although he too shows an active concern somewhat more subtly than Sara. Saraellen is upset and resentful that so much parental attention and energy is being spent on Paul, although she recognizes that he is having a hard time and wouldn't want to be in his position.

The patterns of identification in the family are complex, and include an overt and acknowledged as well as a more subtle and unacknowledged level. Sara and William explicitly attempt to change the patterns of their families of origin in their own families, and they are successful as well as unsuccessful in their attempts. The same-sex pairs of William and Paul, Sara and Saraellen are linked by temperament and activities, which include the parents' work interests. They are also described as having emotionally closer relationships. Paul and Sara's relationship is described as openly negative; Paul frequently criticizes his mother and resents her intrusion into his privacy. In spite of this, Paul and Sara are very closely connected in ways which are linked with Sara's experience of herself as an adolescent and of her mother. Sara explicitly re-

fers to Paul's problems as a place where she can be a sensitive parent, in contrast to her parents during her adolescent crisis. There is some evidence that Sara is identifying with Paul and duplicating elements of her "symbiotic" relationship with her mother, but this is a covert theme in the family. William's relationship with Paul also has undercurrents of his relationship with his father. At one point he referred to the fact that Paul had yet to prove himself as an artist, in a voice that belonged to a Puritan work ethic patriarch. William identifies with Paul as the oldest son, he refers to Paul's position in the extended family as the eldest son of the eldest son.

The relationship of both parents to Saraellen seems less complicated, and they attribute this to the fact that they see her as "well defended" in comparison to Paul, whom they see as needing more encouragement and protection. It seems that both parents are more identified with Paul and are differentiated from Saraellen, which may account for her ability to maintain firmer boundaries. She may also have developed her "defensive" style as a maneuver for getting some of the attention that was being lavished on Paul as the eldest. Sara and Saraellen are able to talk openly about their feelings, although Saraellen refers to her mother's intrusiveness as increasingly keeping her from disclosing feelings about her problems in fear that her mother will take an active part. Sara talks about encouraging Saraellen's writing and career interests, and she wants her daughter to have the option of considering a career. William sees Saraellen as "tough and brassy," and although he spends more time with her than Sara does at this point, he prefers Paul's company--which infuriates Saraellen.

Both children, particularly Paul, are currently going through a crisis which seems to take its form from the patterns of identification in the family and which seems to have been triggered by the recent changes in the family's life style. Both are resentful of the changes in their family work arrangements. They complain that their parents spend too much time away from home during the evening. Paul fantasized about a business that he and his father could put together to become "breadwinners" based on their shared art interests. Saraellen resents her parents' absorption in their new work lives and is the most vocal in objecting to their frequent evenings out. She talked about the difficulties her parents had in changing their work roles, then commented that men and women have different roles "and that's one thing that they can never seem to forget."

Summary of Sex-role Themes

The Thomas's are a couple with a non-traditional work allocation who made a recent transition from the traditional work allocation earlier in their marriage. They are androgynous in their personal characteristics and marital relationship, and their ten-year attempt to fit these androgynous characteristics to traditional family roles grew increasingly dissatisfying. Their dramatic, role-reversed shift went too far in the opposite direction and placed their family under a great deal of stress. At this point, they are moving to a more balanced sharing and integration of work and parenting roles begun by William's return to part-time teaching.

Sara's work development has involved a movement towards profession-

al self-definition and renunciation of traditional role expectations. She identified with her mother and older sister, both of whom she described as adnrogynous. Both her mother and father struggled with traditional, dissatisfying work roles, and did not expect her to plan a career. Her contact with the feminist movement was an important influence on her change in roles and career decision. William's work development towards the choice of an artistic career has also involved a split from his patriarchal father's model. His feelings about work show the androgynous integration of an identification with both his largely mythical artistic mother and his traditionally masculine father. He was also influenced by his father's dissatisfaction with his work as an engineer and preference for a scholarly career.

The same-sex parent and child pairs in the Thomas's nuclear family are strongly identified with each other through interests and personal characteristics. Paul Thomas, 13, has androgynous interests and personal characteristics for which he is ridiculed at the junior high school. He feels closest to his father and identifies with his androgynous characteristics. At the same time he feels a strong pull from his mother's identification with his adolescent crisis, and is struggling to resist it. Saraellen, 12, feels closest to her mother and identifies with her androgynous characteristics. Both Sara and William strongly identify with their same-sex child, and in addition are identifying with Paul's adolescent crisis. Sara and William have created parenting styles largely discontinuous from their experiences in their families of origin. They have retained a strong commitment to family rituals and activities, and have added to that a warm and close relationship to their children

individually. At the same time, each has brought elements of which they are not aware from their relationship to the same-sex parent and these are undercurrents in their relationships with their children. For Sara, this is an echo of her symbiotic relationship with her mother; for William, of his father's rigorous demands and standards of achievement.

The Greene Family

Loraine and Eric, both 40, have been married for twelve years and have two children, Jessica, 7, and Mark, 5. They were introduced by mutual friends in the summer of 1960 at an art school in New England where Loraine was enrolled as a scholarship student and Eric was an alumnus returning to work for the summer. Loraine was 24, had graduated from college, married divorced, and was returning to school for a master's degree in art. Eric had graduated from college, spent a year overseas in the Army, enrolled in and dropped out of graduate school, and was on his way to his hometown to begin a studio. They married in 1964 and began their successful partnership as designers and producers of furniture. Their work remains the strongest link in their relationship. Because the studio is next to their home, their work and family lives are closely integrated. They see parenting as their lowest interest commitment, although both take their parenting responsibilities seriously.

Loraine Greene

Loraine is a lively, energetic, aggressive woman who is highly articulate and speaks with humor and self-confidence. She became Eric's

partner in his studio at the time of their marriage, and has since then handled all the business and administrative work as well as part of the production. Loraine and Eric agree that her business and organizational skills are largely responsible for the financial success of their work. Except for heavy production periods around Christmas, the efficient organization of their work leaves Loraine with free time to pursue other activities. She reads a great deal, gardens, does yoga, is interested in travelling and last year went alone for a two-week vacation in Italy. She is a committed feminist and was part of a women's support group for a year two years ago, has taken several courses at the university women's center.

Personal history. Loraine grew up in a small, working class community in Rhode Island and was the only child of middle class Jewish parents. Her father was an eccentric and unambitious man, the oldest son of a wealthy merchant who refused to have any contact with business. He was often unemployed, at times taught violin lessons and for a few years did unskilled factory work. Her mother was the emotional and financial head of the household, she owned a successful women's clothing store and worked a 60-hour week. Her father's lack of ambition was a great disappointment to her mother, and their marriage was in constant conflict over this issue. The rift between them was increased by the death of their first child, a boy who died at the age of 8 months. After the infant's death, her father refused to have more children in spite of her mother's wishes, and Loraine's birth was an accident. They stayed together because of family pressures, and were divorced the year Loraine left home for college.

Loraine describes her father as passive and sort of pathetic, sometimes affectionate, but largely distant. She describes her mother as the parent who "counted", and they had a difficult and conflictual relationship. Loraine felt her mother was distant, cold, demanding, and critical. She grew up longing for a "regular" family with a strong father who was head of the household and a mother who would meet her at home after school and give her milk and cookies. She describes herself as a lonely and anxious child who was very bright but didn't fit in with her peers. She found a social niche with the early discovery of sexuality, and was particularly happy during her high school years. She had become interested in art, was editor of the school newspaper and director of the school social activities. During her last year in high school, Loraine began a passionate relationship with another senior boy who was the school's artist. The relationship lasted until her last year of college at Wellesley.

Her years at Wellesley were painfully unhappy, she felt intellectually and socially inferior to the prep school girls, She immersed herself in her school work as an art history major and received above average grades. Her high school romance floundered, then intensified, and they were engaged her senior year. At this point, Loraine was prepared to marry an artist and be an artist's wife. She had made no career plans and when the relationship ended she was devastated and deeply depressed. She went to New York City with a friend, where both worked as secretaries. She passively drifted into marriage a year later, which lasted a year. Her husband was an established writer and 10 years older and she described the marriage as disastrous from the beginning. A few months af-

ter the marriage, Loraine began an analysis because the marriage was in trouble, remained in therapy for two years. She became interested in functional sculpture, and after separating from her husband focused on developing her skill as an artist. She was talented and successful, and realized she was interested in pursuing art as a career. After a year she applied to a master's degree program, was accepted and offered a scholarship. She met Eric the summer before she entered graduate school at a school in New England.

Eric Greene

Eric initially seems shy and reticent, but emerges as articulate with a quick sense of humor which is sometimes sharp and caustic, and which is as often used to create tension as to break it. Eric is more focused on his work to the exclusion of other activities, enjoys experimenting with new pieces and does artistic work with wood and metal beyond their standard production pieces. He particularly enjoys the role of experienced mentor in relation to other artists, is often approached by people who need advice or support for their work. Eric formed a men's support group shortly after their move to this area and participated in it for a year, declaring proudly that he had beat Loraine to it. His major activity outside of work is film and television watching.

Personal history. Eric was born in a small town in New York and has a brother 7 years older. His father was a brilliant chemist with a degree from Harvard who was not ambitious or aggressive in his work. When his specialized work as a chemist became obsolete, he went into the liquor business and was initially successful although both his work and

his position in the family gradually deteriorated. Eric's mother was the dominant head of the household, who criticized her husband's passivity which drove him more deeply into himself. He had an increasingly heavy drinking problem through the last years of his life and died of a stroke when Eric was 16. Eric describes himself as very close to and dependent on his mother, but identified with his father. He states that he saw the family situation completely through his mother's eyes until his marriage, when Loraine pulled him away from his mother. Eric greatly admired his older brother as a child, but now sees that he is a weak and unsuccessful man with many personal problems including alcoholism.

Eric describes himself as a shy, withdrawn, sensitive boy. His early interest in art became a source of self-esteem as well as a basis for important relationships throughout his life. He became close to an art teacher in elementary school with whom he had contact until high school, and he felt closer to her than to his family. In high school he was invoived with an "artsy" crowd, many of whom went as he did to Pratt College in New York. He became interested in sculpture there, and began to work with a teacher who later became his partner in a studio. Eric had trouble approaching girls, but in college became seriously involved with a girl whom he almost married because she became pregnant. They both decided to break off the relationship, but Eric was deeply affected by the separation. Shortly after he was drafted overseas into the Army, which was the first time he left home. He spent a year in graduate school after his return, and realized he wanted to be doing his own work. The summer after he left graduate school he met Loraine.

Couple's Relationship

Loraine and Eric were initially attracted to each other by their shared work interests and involvement with an artistic community. They have personal identities which are sex-role reversed along important dimensions, and which they brought to the relationship. Eric saw Loraine as strong, experienced, competent, and independent. Loraine saw Eric as shy, naive, creative, and supportive. They met and became sexually involved in the summer of 1960, then had little contact when Loraine began graduate school and Eric returned home to set up a studio. Their relationship became a more serious involvement in 1962 when Loraine left school and went to Eric's studio to finish writing her thesis. At the point when she suggested that they marry, Loraine felt the need to settle down in a stable relationship. Eric hesitated at first because he was reluctant to make the commitment, described himself as elated and relieved when she pursued and he conceded. Loraine helped Eric separate from his mother and organize his work more efficiently and profitably. Eric provided Loraine with security in a relationship and direction in her work. Their work remains the most stable and secure dimension of their relationship. They have a division of labor which is personally enjoyable and highly profitable, based on mutual respect for each other's competencies. This is in marked contrast to their emotional relationship at the time of the interviews, which was often destructively angry or independent and indifferent. Both were experiencing a great deal of personal turmoil, including dissatisfaction with their relationship, which they found impossible to share with the other.

The Greenes are increasingly pursuing independent activities and

relationships and have an explicit non-monogamous sexual contract. At this point, their lives are held together by their shared commitments to work and parenting, without which they would probably separate.

Jessica Greene

Jessica was 7 years old and in 3rd grade at the time of the interviews. She is a boisterous, energetic, and strong-willed girl who told me quite explicitly she found the interview boring and uncomfortable. Jessica does well in school, is creative and artistically talented, and the bedroom she shares with Mark displayed many of her drawings. She reads a great deal and is going through a Charlie Brown phase, told me with mixed pride and discontent that her teacher makes her check out higher level library books as well. Jessica enjoys clothes and dressing up, although she complained about several situations in which there were strict expectations about the clothes she was supposed to wear. She is somewhat lonely and isolated from her peers, longs for her best friend in Vermont, and states that she is unhappy in Massachusetts and doesn't belong here. Jessica talked about the segregation of boys and girls in elementary school, and it seemed that she would have been friends with one of the boys had the rest of the girls not teased her about it. She said her parents tell her she's an artist, and she might be an artist when she grows up, or she might be an office girl.

Marc Greene

Marc was five years old and in kindergarten at the time of the interviews. He is physically frail, is taking medication for allergies,

and is somewhat anxiously active. The most salient theme in our interview was his active competition with Jessica and the insecurity caused by his inevitable failure in attempting to catch up with his older sister. We began the interview in their shared bedroom, which appears to be his sister's turf. Marc claimed he had drawn a number of her art productions, told me that he could read and that his favorite activity was drawing, both of which are Jessica's competencies and not his own. Marc is having a difficult time in school and was recently placed with the four-year-old children because he refuses to do the work at his age level. He is very unhappy with this situation.

Marc seemed much more comfortable in an adjoining family room which was strewn with his toys. His favorite activities are musical, he has a record collection and several musical toys. He told me that his father is teaching him to play the drums, and showed me another musical toy Eric had made him. He also showed me a toy stove which he plays with, and told me excitedly that the oven lights up. Marc said he wants to be a sculptor when he grows up, and to go to a "bigger school."

Sibling Relationships

Jessica and Marc are often each other's companions, although they are increasingly pursuing their own activities. Marc seems very angry at Jessica and expresses it aggressively, and Jessica claims she doesn't hit him back because he's younger. Jessica is physically much healthier than Marc. Eric stated that at birth Jessica had an Apgard score of 9.99 and Marc a score of 7.77, and claims that these still differentiate the children in their personal characteristics.

Family History

At the time of their marriage, Loraine joined Eric in his studio, where he was working with a partner. This arrangement didn't work out, and they decided to move to Vermont a year later. They bought a house and built a studio on the grounds, and worked intensely at their furniture production. Loraine felt she wanted children, and although Eric objected initially he later agreed. Jessica was born in early 1968, and Marc was born in early 1970. At that point, Loraine was managing the household and childcare and continuing to work. Late in 1970 they restructured their work arrangements, and began to share household and childcare on a scheduled basis. They were becoming increasingly unhappy with their isolation in Vermont and finally decided to move when Loraine agreed to come to this area, which they did in 1972.

Division of Labor and the Meaning of Work

The Greenes' distribution of household and childcare responsibilities has changed several times over the course of their marriage. Before the children were born, they shared household tasks as well as responsibilities in the studio. Both were very involved with work. Eric was a creative cook and often took responsibility for meals. From Jessica's birth in 1968 until 1971, Loraine did most of the housework and childcare. Because the studio was next to the house she could freely move back and forth, and during Jessica's infancy she would bring her to the studio during the day. When Mark was born, the extra work of childcare was compounded by the fact that Jessica was no longer napping away the hours in a playpen and was now an active toddler. This made it im-

possible for Loraine to take care of the children and keep up her work in the studio. She decided the situation had to change when, as Eric stated, "the shit hit the fan" and the feminist movement entered their lives in the form of the first Ms. Magazine issue. At that point, Loraine insisted that they divide housework and childcare according to a daily schedule. They continued this arrangement for several years and gradually gave up the strict schedulde for a more spontaneous allocation of work as the children got older.

At the time of the interviews, their spontaneous arrangement had returned to the point where Loraine was doing most of the household chores. She was very angry about this but had not expressed her feelings to Eric; he was aware of her anger but was waiting for her to bring it up. The interview became the arena for a discussion which was at times hostile and attacking, tensely humorous, and eventually came down to the essential issues with clarity and directness. Loraine described the process by which tasks are taken care of as a "guilt trip and power play", Eric referred to it as a "claim to greatest martyrdom" in which they are constantly involved. Since their work at home and at the studio is so closely linked, their allocation of tasks throughout the day shifts from one work space to another. At this point, both agree that each takes responsibility for the tasks they are more skilled at and concerned about. This means that their division of labor has returned to a largely sex-typed allocation. Childcare remains essentially shared, and Loraine thinks Eric spends somewhat more time with the children. She does housework and paper work whereas Eric does more repair and maintenance work. In contrast to their angry bickering about housework and childcare, their

discussion about division of work in the studio was easy, straightforward and remarkably non-competitive. Eric is more involved with production than Loraine, she takes care of business contracts and manages the finances for both studio and household. They each have production pieces which they designed individually, but they collaborate in their work on every piece.

Both Loraine and Eric take a great deal of pride in the professional position they have achieved, and seem very satisfied with their partnership. At the same time they are assessing their individual professional development and their goals for the future. Loraine feels she has reached the peak of her creative capacity as an artist, and sees her growth in that area as limited. She is considering the idea of changing professions so as to use her verbal skills, and she is interested in work in feminist counseling. She doubts, however, that she would take that radical a step at a point when they are reaping the financial rewards of their professional competence. Eric is doing more artistic sculpture, although not as much as he would like. He complains that it is difficult to concentrate on artistic pieces at home. He said he would like to blame his financial responsibility to the children for the fact that he has not professed more as an artist, but that Loraine won't let him get away with it. He has been setting up opportunities for work in sculpture at conferences, and does occasional shows. He feels that artistic sculpture is easy when compared to the more difficult task of creating simple, functional and attractive pieces for production. Their work pace has slowed down substantially, and they have shifted their work period to coincide with the children's day.

Parenting and Parent-child Relationships

Loraine and Eric are responsible parents but are not enthusiastically child-centered. Both agree that if they had known before what they now know about what it's like to have children, they would never have had them. They see their style of parenting as self-centered: if the children demand attention loudly enough thei will attend to them long enough to quiet them. At the same time they feel guilty about this, and are making increasing efforts to spend more time with them. Since they work on the grounds of their home, the children have easy access to them and generally make contact with one of them in the afternoon. Loraine mentioned explicitly that she never wanted her children to come home to an empty house the way she did, and she is often in the house in the afternoon when they come in. She stated that in spite of her negative feelings about her mother's style of parenting and her resolution that she would not treat her children that way, she is amazed at the ways she resembles her mother as a parent and hears her mother's voice when she screams at the children.

The pairs of Eric and Marc, and of Loraine and Jessica seem identified with each other and share more interests and personality characteristics. Marc is further identified by his parents with Loraine's "eccentric" father. Marc says he's closer to his mother, and Jessica says she's closer to her father because her mother is too strict. Loraine and Eric do not explicitly discourage sex-typed games and activities for the children, and feel that their own work partnership and allocation of responsibilities should serve as a model. Eric and Marc often cook together, and both children spend time in the studio and are encouraged

to be artistic and creative. Loraine and Eric feel they live from month to month in their goals as parents. They are more concerned that Marc should make it to first grade and Jessica to a two-wheeler than that they should grow up to be doctors and self-actualize.

Summary of Sex-role Themes

The Greenes are a couple with a non-traditional work allocation who have closely integrated work and family lives. Their personal characteristics and relationships are androgynous, and created by the integration of sex-typed and cross-sex characteristics. They have shared their professional work and household responsibilities since the beginning of their marriage. Childcare responsibilities have been their major area of negotiation. Their transition from a traditional to an egalitarian distribution of childcare was initiated by Loraine. It was triggered by the heavy demands of two infants paired with the influence of the feminist movement. Loraine and Eric both experienced strong, dominant mothers and weak fathers in their families of origin, and are replicating that pattern in their marital relationship. Loraine's identification with her mother has been an important element in her professional development. Eric's personality characteristics seem linked to his identification with his father and brother. His successful and satisfying work as an artist has since early childhood been influenced by people outside the family, and has counterbalanced the self-destructive messages in his family of origin relationships.

The same-sex parent and child pairs are identified with each other in their personality characteristics. Jessica Greene, 8, has androgynous

interests and characteristics, while her conceptualization of sex-roles is at a bipolar stage of development. She feels closer to her father because she sees her mother as too strict. This is related to Loraine's identification as a parent with her critical and demanding mother; Loraine's demandingness seems to be elicited by her daughter more frequently than by her son. Marc, 5, has androgynous interests and characteristics, and his conceptualization of sex-roles is at a stage of concrete physical differences. He states that he is closer to his mother; he is identified by the family with both his father and his "eccentric" maternal grandfather. Important themes for Marc are his attempts at and failure in competing with Jessica, which seem to reinforce a sense of incompetence.

Both Loraine and Eric have found parenting demanding and highly stressful. Loraine sees her parenting self as like her mother in spite of her attempts to become a warmer and more accepting parent. Eric seems to be more consistently the nurturant parent, although he resents the children's intrusions into his artistic development.

The Singer Family

Adele, 38, and Joel, 37, have been married for 13 years and have two children, Richard, 12, and Edward, 5. They met in 1959, were introduced by their families during Adele's first year in graduate school at Brown and Joel's last year as an undergraduate at New York University. They had increasing contact when Joel went to graduate school at Brown, and married in the fall of 1962 at which point Adele had entered the doctoral program in political science and Joel was in his third year of a

M.F.A. degree. Adele works part time in the political science department, Joe works as a tenured faculty member in the English department, both at colleges in the area. They are a verbally articulate and highly intellectual couple. Their household reflects their focus and commitment to both work and parenting. They describe themselves as "child centered" and are organizing their work lives around their parenting responsibilities. Their marital relationship is based on their shared commitments and ideology, and centered around the choreography of work and parenting responsibilities.

Adele Singer

Adele is warm and friendly and speaks articulately and with highly abstract, intellectual speech. She seemed energetic and enthusiastic although somewhat tense about the interviews. In addition to her part-time teaching and half-time parenting, Adele is active in town politics and school committees, does gardening, and spends a good deal of time in activities related to her interest and commitment to women's studies. She moved from a full-time tenure track to a part-time position when Edward was born, both to free up more time for his care and to postpone a tenure decision she didn't feel ready for, At this point, her commitment to women's studies has given her work and particularly her writing a more coherent direction, and she plans to reapply for a full-time position in the next few years.

Personal history. Adele grew up in California, the middle daughter of Jewish immigrant parents both of whom left Eastern Europe at the age of 11 and met in New York City. She has a brother 8 years older and a

sister 8 years younger. Adele's father ran a prosperous department store, and Adele describes their family as upper middle class. Her mother had worked as a secretary in New York City until her marriage, and then worked in the department store as her husband's assistant throughout their marriage. She describes both parents as having aspired to higher professions: her father was very active in liberal activities, prided himself on his intellect, and Adele thinks he would have gone to law school had he the opportunity. Her mother aspired to be a dancer, thought herself to be a shrewd businessperson, but had been brought up in a traditional household and remained deferent to her husband. Adele describes herself as closely identified with her father's intellect and rationality, and with her mother's "femininity" and gregariousness, although she didn't feel close to either parent. She would take her father's side in his arguments with her mother. She describes him as demanding and ambitious for his children but not often present as a parent. She saw her mother as more conservative and less intelligent than her father. She describes her mother as highly emotional and fluctuating unpredictably between servitude and selfishness. She states that her mother was closest to and favored her older brother.

Adele adored her older brother who saw her as bothersome although he enjoyed taking the role as teacher. She saw him as a masculine ideal until her teens, when she began to see him as flawed, particularly in his relationships to women. Adele describes herself as at times in rivalry but essentially closer to her younger sister with whom she took the protective stance that her brother took in relation to her. She saw her sister as shy, sour, more "feminine," and feels that her sister was the

most hurt by the family dynamics. She states that her family discouraged the expression of any negative emotions, and permitted only positive ones. All three children were highly protected, but her brother had more freedom. Adele has become closer to her mother since her marriage. She sees her as helpful and supportive and she feels her father is becoming even more self-centered and withdrawn.

Adele describes herself as a child as temperamental and stubborn--happy and easygoing externally, but lonely and misunderstood. She was an intellectually precocious child, and was two grades ahead in school. This meant that she was always two years younger than her classmates. She felt lonely and alienated from peers and didn't catch up with them until she entered puberty at the age of 14. In high school she began to be accepted through academic recognition. She feels she became more skilled at "learning how to please" in social relationships, although she wasn't very popular and dated infrequently. She was bored by school until high school and was demanding of teachers who actively disliked and rejected her. Her first connection with a teacher was with a radical American history teacher in high school who was very influential.

Adele went to UCLA at the age of 16, and chose it because her brother had gone to Berkeley. She had few friends in college until her last years and little romantic involvement. Adele was very excited by her academic work. She had started out wanting to be a high school social studies teacher but hated the education sequence. Although her parents discoraged her career interests, she received support from a career counselor and her teachers to continue in graduate school. She became interested in political science and went to Brown graduate school expecting to

to get an M. She met Joel her first year at Brown. Although she became seriously involved with someone that year, they broke up in part because of religious differences, in part because of her growing relationship with Joel.

Joel Singer

Joel is a tall, thin, intense-looking man with thick shoulder-length hair. He speaks with highly articulated and intellectual language similar to Adele's but with a somewhat slower and more deliberate pace. He seemed relaxed during the interviews, was carefully sensitive to my needs and anxieties as an interviewer and supportive of my work. Joel is focused on his full-time faculty position and half-time parenting as well as his own writing, sees his work interest as equally divided between teaching and writing. In part through his courses in black and African literature, he has become involved with the black students at his college as a house advisor in racial crises. He writes in a number of forms, and his most recent completed work is a novel. His teaching involved a lot of individual contact with students as he sees them through various stages of writing.

Personal history. Joel's family grew up in New York City and his parents are Jewish European immigrants both of whom came the New York as children. He is the oldest son and has three younger sisters, the older five years younger, and next 10 years younger, and the last younger by 16 years. Joel describes his family as eccentric and reclusive, unable to communicate either with the outside world or with each other. His father was a kosher butcher who had hoped to be a violinist. His mother

worked as a secretary until their marriage, and although she often talked about returning to work because of their insecure financial situation she never did. Joel describes his father as articulate and emotionally withdrawn but clearly suffering and vulnerable. He had wide mood swings, was often punitive and was fearful and mistrustful of the outside world. Joel felt closer to his mother because she revealed more of her emotions. She protected him from his father's anger and would communicate his father's feelings to the children. He states that he was intrigued by his father's emotional life, and shared an interest in music with him. He was closest to his oldest sister, and felt linked to her by their shared shyness, fearfulness of and difficulty with social relationships. As the oldest and the son, he received the most parental attention and encouragement as well as blame for sibling conflicts. Joel sees himself as increasingly less like his family since his marriage and has little contact with them, although he is linked to them emotionally and still has feelings of insecurity about them. He sees the youngest as the real casualty of the family's asocial patterns, describes her as much like Laura in "The Glass Managerie."

Joel had few social contacts until high school, and only then did he begin to realize the anomalies of his family life. He was intellectually precocious, and from kindergarten was singled out and favored by teachers. He became interested in writing in elementary school, seeing it as an outlet for emotional expression. In high school he became interested in journalism. He found friends at school he could be close to. He found it easier to be closer to girls and had several female friendships which were unrequited as love affairs. After graduating from high

school, Joel lived at home and went to New York University. He was an English major and was on the newspaper staff, but quit because they insisted on aggressive rather than accurate writing. He took numerous music courses, and feels he pushed his talent in music to its limits. Joel hated N.Y.U., saw his courses as irrelevant to the outside world, was becoming increasingly radical politically. He felt his teachers were unresponsive to his needs and put off by his intensity. He had glancing relationships with male friends in college with whom he became closer in later years. He applied to Brown because the recipient of his unrequited love was applying to a Brown graduate program. He already knew Adele when he went to Brown, and she helped orient him there. They became increasingly close during his first year there, and became romantically involved in his second year and her third.

Couple's Relationship

Adele and Joel felt attracted to each other by a number of similarities in their backgrounds as well as in their interests and ideology. Both were from Jewish immigrant families but were atheists and uninvolved with religion. Both are articulate and highly intellectual and had found in their intellect a satisfaction which they totally lacked in their social relationships. Although both had strong work interests, neither was strongly committed to a specific goal and they found direction in the context of important relationships. They shared a radical political ideology which was formed both within their families and in rejection of them. They had similar interests in music which were their strongest link in a highly ambivalent relationship with their same-sex parent.

When the Singers decided to marry, they agreeed that Adele would pursue her interest in teaching and would financially support Joel in his work as a writer. Adele and Joel were both still in graduate school at the time of their marriage, and Adele began teaching at a small college while Joel finished his last year in the M.F.A. program. Because Adele became pregnant a few months after their marriage, their work plans were altered so as to free Adele's time for the care of their child. The timing of the pregnancy meant that the marital relationship had just begun to form and solidify when it had to incorporate both a parenting role and more financially productive work.

The Singers find it difficult to spend as much time together as they would like because of the time and energy demanded by their other commitments. They actively share each other's work, particularly their writing, and use each other for criticism and feedback from an outside perspective. They feel closely connected by their strong commitments to an ideology of creative parenting and shared work roles, and describe themsleves as most competitive with and judgmental of others in this sphere.

Richard Singer

Richard is in 7th grade, a friendly, intelligent, and articulate boy who was very talkative and highly anxious throughout the interview. His single greatest interest which he pursues with intensity is his extensive collecttion of cacti and succulents, and he enjoys talking to his plants. He often prefers the companionship of his plants to that of people and is somewhat shy although he has several close school and neigh-

borhood friends with whom he spends time. In addition to his interest in plants and nature, Richard plays the trombone in the school band, is interested in classical music, reads a great deal of science and non-fiction. He is interested in numerous sports, particularly team sports. He enjoys playing positions like the fullback in soccer which are less spectacular and less popular and which he can have to himself. He likes having interests and ideas which are unique and individual, and coming up with the rare and relevant response to a question. Richard enjoys school most when he can pursue debates with his classmates rather than sit passively. He also likes to help other kids at school with their work, although most of his teachers don't allow children to move around freely enough to do that. His favorite subjects are science, English and home economics.

Richard's close friends are all boys, but he says that's changing and he'll begin to have friendships with girls when his friends do. He thinks that aside from physical differences, the differences between boys and girls are caused by expectations about the kinds of activities they are supposed to do well. He feels girls have more restrictions than boys at this time, although he sees this as changing, Richard has been reading about careers in horticulture, and would like to study plants and birds in college.

Edward Singer

Edward is in nursery school, an active, creative and demanding child who was initially distant during the interview but became very comfortable and talkative. Edward expresses his feelings overtly, and is

particularly aggressive in expressing anger. He has a wide array of toys and games, prefers to role play with a Sesame Street village and Weebles tree house. He likes to paint and draw, and his play room is adorned with a series of his pictures labeled by one of his parents. He watches television frequently, and his favorite show is the Six Million Dollar Man which is one of his dolls. Edward is interested in Richard's activities and has also begun a cactus collection. He talked about sex differences in terms of concrete physical differences such as body parts, shoes, hair. It is interesting that he described women as having longer hair than men, since Adele's hair is only slightly longer than Joel's.

Sibling Relationship

Edward is going through a period of intense rivalry with his older brother, and will go to any lengths to keep his parents from attending to Richard. Richard is remarkably patient and understanding about this, and works hard at finding ways to talk to his parents which do not provoke Edward, although he is also angry at his brother and resents having to be so careful around him. Richard often babysits for Edward, and he remarked with perplexity that his younger brother is less trouble when his parents aren't around.

Family History

After Joel received his M.F.A., he was offered an English teaching job at the University of Louisiana through a Brown connection. They moved there the summer of 1963, and Richard was born a few months later. Adele made no work commitments outside the home and worked exclusively at

childcare. Joel worked full time at the university, although he arranged his teaching schedule so as to be able to spend afternoons at home and help with the children. Richard's infancy and the couple's adjustment to parenting was complicated by the child's early colic and later severe eczema which made his care even more difficult. Adele's mother joined them for 6 weeks of Richard's life, which marked the beginning of a closer relationship between them. During this year Joel decided he enjoyed teaching and wanted to return to graduate school for his doctorate. At the same time Adele decided she needed to continue her professional development as well, and both returned to their Brown programs for their doctorates. Because Joel had to take a year of coursework, Adele got a teaching job at a small college and began work on her dissertation.

They family loved to this area in 1965, when Adele got a full-time job in the political science department where she is now working. Since both were writing their dissertations at that point, they chose this area because it would allow them to remain in contact with their Brown departments. Adele received her doctoral degree in 1967, and continued working full time. Joel began applying for jobs in 1967, kept receiving rejections because of a misrepresentative letter in his file which described him as an "agitator." When he found out about the letter at the time of his present job application he had other material added to clarify the situation, was accepted and began teaching full time in 1969. In 1970, Adele came up for a tenure decision and became pregnant with Edward. She states that rather than enter into a tenure decision at a point when she had not published sufficiently, and also because it would

allow her time to take care of a child, she chose to work part-time and took a 1/3 time teaching position. At that time they bought a home, and Edward was born the following year in 1971. Joel received tenure in 1974, and the family intends to stay in the area.

Division of Labor and the Meaning of Work

The Singers have equally distributed household and childcare responsibilities, and have dovetailed their work schedules so as to have an adult available to their children at all times. Joel teaches in the morning, Adele works at home while both children are in school. She picks up Edward from nursery school at one and spends active time with him until Joel's return home at 1:30. Joel takes care of Edward in the afternoon while Adele teaches, she cooks dinner when she returns and he cleans up afterwards. Both are available to the children until 8:00, after which they focus on their own work. Adele is out two or three evenings a week for various meetings, and Joel is generally home in the evening. Edward receives the bulk of attention. Richard is old enough to pursue his own activities and the family feels the younger child has a greater need for parental attention.

They generally rely on outside help for housecleaning, although they have trouble getting someone working consistently and are frequently between housekeepers. Adele takes responsibility for making these arrangements, and feels that in general she takes more responsibility for organizing housework tasks. Because Adele was injured in 1970 and can do little lifting, Joel tends to do the heavier house and yard work such as vacuuming and washing floors, laundry, and food shopping. Adele does the

remainder of indoor cleaning, menu planning, cooking, keeps their summer garden, and both "pick up." Joel handles the balancing of their finances, although they agree that Adele is the more active "consumer" and does much of the non-food shopping, initiates and plans rennovative work on their house. Adele does the sewing, and because she's the only one who can iron they buy permanent press clothes. They are aware that there is a high degree of sex-typing in their skills and consequently in their division of housework. Although both would like to learn to do other kinds of work, they have opted for the present arrangement because of its efficiency, and because neither has the time and energy to devote to developing new competencies.

Adele and Joel began their marriage with shared household and childcare responsibilities distributed according to their abilities. Joel actively participated in Richard's care during his infancy, and when Adele began teaching Joel took on sole responsibility for childcare. Joel states with amusement that in their first years in this area, his reputation was based much more on the fact that he was the only father pushing his child on a swing in the middle of the day, than on his other work as a writer.

Joel's work has been developing its direction since his childhood interest in writing, which he describes as his only available means of emotional expression and communication. For Joel, work has continued to be a means of social contact and relationships as well as emotional expression. His interest in writing and teaching were both initiated by external factors, although once those directions were set in motion he became highly focused and intensely committed to them. He felt comfortable

taking on the heavy responsibility for Richard's care, defined himself strongly as both father and writer. He found the job-hunting period a painful one, particularly before he found out the reason for his rejections. He was relieved when he was offered a job which enabled him to return to teaching without having to uproot his family. He continues an interest in socially relevant issues and politically radical movements which began in his high school and college years. Themes of feminist, black, and gay liberation are part of both his teaching and his writing. Because of his commitment to parenting, Joel is not taking on promotion-related work responsibilities, refuses to attend most afternoon committee meetings. He feels that his work ideal would be to teach part-time were he able to do that with job security.

Adele's work history and the meaning of work have also been connected with her important relationships. She began high school with interest in music, and intended to become a piano teacher. She later became interested in social studies, and thought she would become a high school teacher. Adele feels she was held back in her career aspirations by the expectations of family and teachers about women's work. In college she found out through testing that she had highest potential in law and psychoanalysis, feels she might have pursued one of these had she felt surer that as a woman she could indeed train in a rigorous career. She chose Brown because several of her history professors at UCLA had graduated from there, and began her graduate work with the intention of finishing with a master's degree. Once at Brown she realized she wanted to teach at the university level, and decided to continue for her doctorate. Adele put her graduate work aside their year in Louisiana when

Richard was born, then continued with graduate school and teaching full time after that year.

Adele worked full time in her present teaching position until the year she became pregnant with Edward, then began work 1/3 time. At that point she didn't feel a commitment to her area of specialty in political science and hadn't published any of her work. This changed as she became involved with the feminist movement and women's studies, and she is presently writing several articles. Adele has gradually increased her teaching responsibilities since Edward's birth. She expects to reapply for a full time teaching slot at a point when she has enough publications to be assured the position.

Parenting and Parent-child Relationships

Adele and Joel describe themselves as having what many regard as a 1950's attitude about parenting. Their family is actively child-centered, they are committed to serious and creative parenting and seldom leave the children in the care of a baby sitter. In general, they believe in treating their children as equal persons with legitimate demands. Adele and Joel feel they are unique in their commitment to this parenting ideology with a feminist ideology about shared work and parenting roles. Their style of parenting is based on an interest in psychoanalytic theory and child development. Both feel that it is important to gear their demands and discipline to the child's developmental level. For this reason they are focusing their attention on Edward and indulging his needs to own them exclusively at a point when they feel it is important to his development. They encourage and appreciate Richard's help in this situa-

tion, and see him as old enough to pursue his own independent activities. This was also their approach to parenting in relation to Richard, and the indulgence of his early years was followed by limit setting as he grew older. Both Adele and Joel see themselves as providing their children with close parental relationships which neither of them had in their own families.

The Singers describe childrearing as their major source of conflict, because although they agree in their general ideology they don't always agree in their handling of a specific situation. Adele is described as more evenly tempered in her style of discipline, Joel as more volatile and quick to anger, particularly in relation to Edward. Both talk about the difficulty each has in balancing a sensitivity to the child's needs with appropriate demands which will give him a sense of pride in his growth, and coordinating consistent goals and demands between them. Adele describes herself as more demanding of the children's cognitive growth than Joel is. Both feel that they began parenting with an idealized image of the perfect parent as infinitely generous and self-sacrificing, and have begun to temper that with the realization that they have to meet their own needs as well. They also spoke about their initial needs to fully control their children's experience, which they see as giving way to a less intrusive and protective mode of parenting. Both encourage their sons to express emotions freely and to be gentle and sensitive in relationships, although they also value and encourage assertiveness.

Both parents describe the pairs of Joel and Richard, and Adele and Edward as emotionally closer, which they attribute to the fact that Joel

was the primary parenting figure for Richard and Adele for Edward. In their description of the children and discussion of family life, Joel closely identifies with Richard and presents Richard's feelings and needs, and Adele identifies with and speaks for Edward. Adele tended to present the more critical statements about Richard, which Joel would balance, and Joel the more critical about Edward, which Adele would balance. They don't intend to have more children, and Adele spoke of the fact that Edward's growth would bring losses as well as gains because they would not again experience the delight in a young child. This seems related to the developmental stage in her own work which Adele put aside and will have to face when Edward no longer requires close attention. Joel feels that his sometimes inappropriate anger at Edward is "cycled" from other pressures such as work. The anger also seems connected to the relationship, and may be related to the fact that at this point Adele is more actively indulging Edward. In contrast to the emotional closeness of these parent-child pairs, both parents equally share activities with both children. Richard links his interest in plants and music to his relationship with his mother, as well as his interest in reading non-fiction. Joel takes long walks with Edward, often carrying him in a series of "cactus" positions which Edward arranges.

Summary of Sex-role Themes

The Singers are a couple with a non-traditional work allocation who have closely integrated work and family lives and combine clearly articulated feminist ideology with a strong focus on their parenting role. Their personal characteristics and relationships are androgynous. They

have shared their household and childcare responsibilities since the beginning of their marriage and have shifted the primary financial responsibility several times. These shifts in employment and parenting have occurred during tense periods in their personal and family histories, and have become part of the parent-child relationships and patterns of identification. Adele Singer's androgynous characteristics seem linked to her primary identification and closeness with her father and identification with feminine characteristics of her mother. Both her parents were frustrated in their career aspirations, and it is likely that Adele's need for professional achievement is linked to that. The most important influences in her career choice have been professors and, more recently, the feminist movement which has influenced the direction of her professional work as well as relieved her guilt for not being a full-time mother. Joel Singer's androgynous characteristics seem linked to his closeness to his mother and identification with his father. His work has emerged as a means of emotional expression he lacked in his family of origin; it also seems tied to his father's frustrated ambitions as a musician.

Richard Singer, 12, has androgynous interests and characteristics, enjoys being unique and unconventional, and has friends with whom he shares these characteristics. He feel closer to his father, with whom he also most closely identifies, although he takes many of his interests from his relationship with his mother. Edward, 5, has androgynous interests and characteristics, and is at a concrete stage in conceptualizing sex differences. He feels closest to and most identified with his mother. These patterns of identification seem strongly induced by the parents'

identification with the children. Adele had a difficult time with Richard's infancy and turned to work; Joel took over sole childcare responsibilities through a period when he was unable to find a teaching job. Adele took over primary childcare responsibilities for Edward at a point when she shifted to part-time employment to delay a tenure decision she thought would be unfavorable. Each parent identifies with the child he or she parented more exclusively, and seems to resent the spouse's involvement with the other child.

The Bennett Family

Judy and Bob Bennett, both 38, have been married for 17 years and have three children, Brian, 12, Gloria, 8, and Peter, 6. Judy and Bob met in New York in 1954 when both were juniors in high school, and married in 1959 when both graduated from college. Judy works close to full time as a social worker in a community clinic and sees some private clients. Bob is an engineer and designer and recently opened a shop in his office. The Bennett's are a sophisticated couple who share playful humor with a sarcastic edge. Their home is elegantly and carefully designed, at the same time that it reflects an active household with three children and numerous tenants who share living space and meals with the Bennetts.

Judy Bennett

Judy is a warm, energetic, assertive and easily talkative woman who was quickly comfortable with the interview and told me she loved the opportunity to talk about herself after a work week of listening. Judy

takes most of the responsibility for childcare and housework, enjoys her identity as a creative and competent "hausfrau." Until recently she did all the cooking for the family and the several tenants who join them for dinner. In addition to her work as a social worker, Judy has been very active in the feminist community, and is presently involved with the feminist counseling collective she helped form. She swims daily, plays frequent tennis and describes herself as a "lady jock."

Personal history. Judy grew up in New York City, although her family spent her earliest school years in a Long Island suburb. She had a brother who was five years younger, and her mother's father became part of their household when they moved back to the city. Judy describes her maternal grandfather as an aggressive, domineering man who was the masculine head of the household. Her father was a "soft," sensitive man who worked as a businessman. He lacked the power of both his father-in-law and his wife, and became a quiet alcoholic in the face of this family situation. Judy greatly admired and identified with her mother, whom she describes as a beautiful, optimistic, vivacious and competent woman. She worked as administrative assistant to the high school principal and ran a well-organized German household. She reluctantly gave up her work when she learned she was pregnant, and began work again when Judy entered junior high school. Judy feels that her mother looked to her father as a sensitive, feminine-identified man who would be the opposite of her authoritative, dominant father, but was contemptuous of him when he couldn't stand up to her father. Judy's mother and brother had constant, intense power struggles which Judy links to her mother's struggles with her own younger brother in her family of origin. She felt distant from

and somewhat protective of her brother, whom she describes as an angry television watcher. He had a difficult adolescence, and Judy became close to him only after his marriage. Judy was the favorite and oldest grandchild of her grandfather, and preferred him to her father whom she actively avoided after her early childhood.

Judy described herself as a socially and intellectually precocious child. She entered adolescence with a bad case of acne, which made her feel ugly and miserable. At that time she sees herself as having a sociable, popular external self and an internal self of the suffering, introspective teenager. She played piano and danced from the age of three, in high school gave up piano and ballet to focus on interpretive dance. She was an excellent student, and graduated at the top of her class. Judy dated boys from the city's prep schools, and met Bob at a prep school play when both were juniors in high school. She selected Wellesley College in part because it was close to Bob's college and they would be able to stay in touch.

Bob Bennett

Bob is an intensely energetic, wiry man with a somewhat self-deprecating and sarcastic sense of humor. He seemed anxious about the interviewing, felt that as a woman I would be "on Judy's side" but was friendly and communicative during the interviews. Bob is a respected professional, was doing creative and financially successful work until the recent economic recession. At this point his work is bringing in a vastly diminished income, and he jokes about his recently opened store as "selling pencils." Bob is physically active, runs daily and plays tennis,

takes an active part in the design and maintenance of their household.

Personal history. Bob was born in New York City and had four siblings, a sister two years older, a sister two years younger, and two brothers, one five years younger and the other fifteen years younger. His father had a law degree and worked for the FBI for some years, later worked for large corporations. He was busy with work and distant from the family, and Bob describes him as unpredictable and domineering with an eccentric and sometimes crude sense of humor. His mother was an artist and studied at the Rhode Island School for Design. She worked as a housewife until Bob was in late elementary school, then began to work as a substitute teacher and later taught art at the high school Judy attended. Bob describes her as creative and artistic, complimentary and praising of her children but highly critical and demanding, a possessive parent and very competent woman. Bob describes his family as undemonstrative of feelings. He was closest to his mother as he was growing up and shared an interest in music and gardening with her. He states that he became a designer because he was always helping his mother design and furnish "the perfect house." He was very competitive with his sisters, particularly the next younger whom he saw as manipulative. Bob's relationship with his older sister was negative because as the oldest son he dethroned her position of parents' favored child. He describes the older of his younger brothers as the bad guy in the family because of his poor academic performance. The family placed high emphasis on academic achievement, and sent Bob to a local prep school in high school.

Bob describes himself as a studious, responsible boy who got good grades in school and had to work very hard for them. He felt both dis-

dainful and frightened of his peer culture, and instead was involved with his studies, track and working on his parents' houses. He was a track star in high school, which he felt he accomplished out of discipline and endurance rather than out of real talent. Bob states that he was recognized as special by his peers, because he was always elected president of his classes, but wasn't particularly close to people and felt socially awkward. His relationship with Judy was his first intense involvement with a girl, and he said he would have liked to have gotten married during college but their families wouldn't have accepted that. He went to Harvard in civil engineering, feels he was an admissions error. Bob states he was completely over his head intellectually and socially, was no longer the "big fish in the small pond." He said he changed to the school of design from engineering because it was more socially acceptable, and during this senior year he began the three-year graduate program.

Couple's Relationship

Judy and Bob were attracted to each other from early in their relationship. Judy saw him as from a more intellectual and refined background than hers. Bob saw her as more socially skilled and outgoing than he was. At the time they went to college, they weren't considering marriage yet although they were dating seriously. Judy states that she didn't think seriously about a career of her own and saw Bob's work as primary while she was going through college. She went through several majors, finally decided on art history and did a teaching internship during her senior year. During the early years of their marriage, Bob's

career development dominated their relationship. They described their first small apartment as completely taken over by his design projects. Bob was also making major decisions without consulting Judy. This became a major issue in their relationship, and they have worked towards a more equitable distribution of power. Both found this transition difficult. For Judy, it meant accepting a view of herself as intellectual competent and her need for a professional identity. For Bob, it meant accepting Judy as an equal which threatened the equilibrium of his own professional identity. Bob feels that Judy tends to underestimate her capabilities and he tends to overestimate his own. To some extent he experienced her period of professional growth as a threat to his own competence and as a rejection, found her total absorption in her own work very painful.

In some ways, their style as a couple seems based on their experience as siblings in their families of origin. Judy, the older sister, married a younger brother, and both at times relate to each other with the competition for competence that marked their own sibling relationships. Both feel a strong commitment to continue work on their relationship, and value the experience they have shared in seeing each other through their personal and professional identity crises.

Brian Bennett

Brian is 12 years old and in 6th grade, is attractive, highly intelligent, athletic, charming and emotionally sensitive. He is currently absorbed in sports, and is the star on the teams in the variety of sports he participates in. He describes school as boring, does little reading and is disdainful of intellectuality. He is doing advanced work in most

of his subjects in spite of the fact that he does very little schoolwork. Brian gets along well with peers, was president of the elementary school's student council last year, and was described by the teachers who worked with him as a remarkably mature and sensitive group leader. He described his relationship with his parents, and particularly with his mother, as a power struggle. He would like more support from his father whom he feels takes his mother's side regardless of the situation. He feels linked to his father by their shared masculinity, looks up to him while resenting his demands that he do more work around the house. Brian sees sex differences mostly in terms of physical strength and athletic ability; he thinks that boys and girls are expected by society to do different kinds of activities. He would like to be a professional football or baseball player; he doesn't believe--what everybody tells him--that he will like college any better than he likes school now.

Gloria Bennett

Gloria is 8 years old and in 3rd grade, is a beautiful, graceful and energetic child who is intelligent and talkative. She has been doing ballet since she was three and proudly displays her awards from ballet school. She has a closet full of dolls and their accessories, loves to dress up her dolls and herself. She describes herself as closer to her mother because she spends more time with her; they go on shopping trips together and both have pierced ears. Gloria is described by the rest of the family as hot-tempered and unpredictably emotional, particularly with anger which she does not hesitate to express. She likes being a girl because girls can do more things than boys such as dress up and wear

their hair long.

Peter Bennett

Peter is 6 years old and in the 1st grade, an active mischievous and charming boy who is trying to catch up to his competent siblings through sheer energy and lungpower and has as a result badly strained his vocal chords. Peter's favorite toy is a long, worn-out rag which he sleeps with and sometimes carries around with him. He rejects the activities of his own age group for those of his older siblings, a situation which is exacerbated by the fact that he is the youngest child in their neighborhood. He is impatient with his own development, and finds it difficult to learn new tasks because he means living with the incompetencies of his age level. He is verbally and socially highly skilled, and his mother commented that he has become adept at using his charms towards getting his needs met in the family.

Sibling Relationships

Brian feels oppressed in the role of older brother because he feels he is blamed for conflicts with his siblings, but he also enjoys watching them grow and being able to teach them new skills. He particularly takes this role in relation to Peter, and likes to teach him sports although he feels Peter is going through a difficult stage. He and Gloria seem to be more distant and competitive, in part because of their very different interests and activities. Gloria and Peter have a quieter and often close relationship.

Family History

After graduation and marriage, Judy and Bob moved into a small apartment in Cambridge and Bob continued his graduate work. Judy was unable to get a teaching job, and states that she was both disappointed and relieved that she wouldn't be teaching. She took a secretarial position at a student counseling center and worked there for seven years. Her salary supported them the first two years of their marriage until Bob graduated, at which point he took a job with a small firm. They waited five years to have children because both felt they wanted to work through their marital relationship before they complicated matters with a third person. Brian was born in the spring of 1964, and during that year Judy had a personal identity crisis with her work. She decided she wanted to return to school and develop a professional career. She began graduate school at Simmons School of Social Work in 1966, the same year that they moved into the renovated home in a slum section which was a major financial and emotional commitment. They lived communally with another couple who had a child, and divided housework and childcare so that Judy was free for her schoolwork. Judy described the year before she entered graduate school as the worst year of her life because of the personal turmoil which preceded her career decision. Bob described the following year as the worst for him because he had to deal with the impact of her professional decision and direction on his own identity. Judy graduated in 1967, and Gloria was born later that year. Peter was born in 1969, which was their last year in Cambridge. Bob was offered a position with a firm in Amherst and they moved to this area in 1969. They sold their slum home for a sizeable profit, and Bob made the move feeling very satis-

fied with his work. For Judy, the move was initially very difficult. She resented having to leave an established network of friends. Peter had a birth disorder which required corrective braces and she was bound to the house. By the end of that year they had moved into their present home, Bob was settled in his new work situation and Judgy had begun her involvement with the feminist movement. Although they would like to stay in this area, Bob's reduced income has placed them in a financially insecure position and they may be forced to return to Cambridge where Bob can find work. He passed up an earlier opportunity to move back with his old firm because the family feels established here and Bob and Judy both want to stay in this area.

Division of Labor and the Meaning of Work

Judy and Bob have chosen a division of labor based on their skills, and feel that it is more important to run an efficient household than to work out a non-sex-typed allocation of responsibilities. Judy feels identified with her hausfrau mother's strivings for competency, and enjoys being a working mother who is a thrifty and creative housewife. Bob cleans up after dinner and takes responsibility for maintenance and repairs. Since the beginning of their marriage he has kept a watchful eye on household design; he mentioned that he even insists on hanging kitchen towels in a particular way. Judy takes major responsibility for childcare; she has arranged her work schedule so as to be home when the children come home from school and she arranges some childcare and housework barters with their tenants. Bob is presently involved with his work to the exclusion of all else. Judy complained about this at the same

time that she takes pleasure in managing the household. She feels she can count on Bob and the children to take over during periods when her work demands more of her time.

Bob's present work situation affected his feelings about his work in general at the time of the interviews. He joked extensively about his Harvard training having prepared him for selling pencils, and talked about feeling secure in his professional identity at the same time that he is clearly experiencing a professional crisis. He talked about the fact that he is only now beginning to learn what design is all about; he used to think it was talent and creativity and has come to realize it is more business than art. He spoke with some bitterness about the high pressure and brutal demands of his graduate training. Bob's work before the recession received both financial and professional recognition, and this helps him through his insecurity stemming from his present lack of work. In the meantime, he is hustling for projects and applying his creativity to the world of business.

Judy feels she has reached a plateau with her work as a social worker after the years of turmoil and development which began with her secretarial position at the Harvard counseling office. Although by the end of her time there she was doing work on the level of the professionals, as a woman without a degree she was doubly disqualified. She went through a difficult period during which she went into individual therapy and realized she wanted to pursue a career. She threw herself into her graduate work with intense commitment, and received her master's degree with a straight A average. Her personal and professional development have in recent years been closely tied to her activities in the feminist

movement, and she has been part of the core group of women who have initiated feminist educational and counseling groups in this area since the early seventies.

Parenting and Parent-child Relationships

Judy and Bob feel they were overly demanding parents with Brian and have now relaxed in their parenting style with Gloria and Peter. Judy has more daily contact with the children. She is most often the one to respond emotionally whereas Bob is the "heavy" who lays down the final ultimatum. Judy tends to intervene earlier than Bob in the children's arguments. Since Judy's year in graduate school they have had a communal arrangement on which they could rely for childcare; this has been an important element in their integration of active work lives with a commitment to parenting.

Both Judy and Bob remain connected to Brian through intense power struggles and emotions. Judy feels that she is at times reproducing her mother's relationship with her younger brother in her relationship with Brian. She said she was amazed at the violent emotions and need to control which he pulls from her. Bob remains demanding and somewhat critical of Brian, and their relationship at times has the air of the sibling competition which was so familiar to Bob in his family of origin. Whereas Judy seems most identified with her mother in her relationship with Brian, she seems identified with Gloria as both parent and child. She started Gloria in ballet at the age of 3, the same age that she had begun ballet. She encourages her daughter's attractiveness and femininity as well as her verbal assertiveness, and her ugly-duckling identity is

thrilled that she has produced these beautiful children. Bob has an easy and affectionate relationship with Gloria and seems the least involved with Peter. Judy seems connected with Peter as her "baby." She feels she too easily falls prey to his charming manipulations and admits that he has learned this art rather successfully. She tries to protect him from his unrealistic competition with Brian, and she recently intervened with the neighborhood gang and asked them to be more sensitive of Peter's needs and insecurities.

Summary of Sex-role Themes

The Bennetts are a couple with a non-traditional work allocation, although their allocation of household and childcare responsibilities is closer to the traditional than the other non-traditional families, particularly for childcare. They are androgynous in their personal characteristics and marital relationship. Judy Bennett enjoys being competent as a working mother and creative "hausfrau," and has closely integrated her family and professional responsibilities. She is aided in this by the communal household arrangements they have had since the infancy of their first child. Bob is more absorbed in his work as a designer and interested in the design of their household as an extension of that. Judy's work development seems closely tied to her identification with an androgynous mother as well as her close relationship to her domineering maternal grandfather. Bob was closest to and identified with his mother, and he links his work as a designer to their relationships. His traditionally masculine father was a distant family member who was also clearly influential.

Brian Bennett, 12, is sex-typed in his interests and characteristics; he closely identifies with his father's masculinity and rejects his mother's femininity and her world of ideas. This seems linked to his highly charged relationship with his mother, which is a replication of Judy's mother's struggle with her son. Gloria Bennett, 8, is also traditionally sex-typed in her interests and characteristics, and identifies with her mother's femininity. The high degree of sex-typing in the two older children seem to be related to their relationship with their same-sex parent, where the child compensates for the parent's personal insecurity about gender identity. Bob's relationship to Brian is also highly charged, and Bob seems to be identifying with his own distant, somewhat eccentric father. Peter, age 6, has as his most dominant theme that of sibling influence; he is androgynous through his attempts at competitively modeling his older brother while at the same time developing independently a charm and skill in social relationships.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The preceding case studies represent a highly condensed and selective view of the already selective interviews with the eight families. The case studies and to a lesser extent the interviews were organized to illuminate the sex role themes within each family. The case studies are a first step in the analysis of the data. The summary section at the end of each case study continues the analysis by extracting significant themes for each family. The discussion takes the next step by examining the sex-role themes extracted in the summaries across the eight families, and exploring the implications for the process of sex-role socialization.

The Impact of Traditional/Non-traditional Distinction on Children

The study began with a broad question about the impact of traditional and non-traditional adult work role allocation in the family on the sex-role development of its children. Are there differences in the sex-role development of children from traditional as opposed to non-traditional families? The answer to this broad statement of the question is no on the basis of the data collected. The children of both traditional and non-traditional families were all androgynous in their personality characteristics, and most were androgynous in their "work" (activities and interests).

The assessment of the children's sex-role identity was based on material from both parent and child interviews describing the child's preferred activities, interests and school performance as well as general

personality characteristics. There were some exceptions to the general pattern of androgyny: in the traditional families, Alan Robertson, Tommy Martin and Irene Martin had traditionally sex-typed activity preferences. In the non-traditional families, Brian Bennett and Gloria Bennett had sex-typed activity preferences. All these children showed androgynous personality characteristics in the terms of my assessment: they had interests and characteristics in both "agentic" or instrumental and "communal" or expressive realms. The finding of traditional sex-typed activity patterns in the five children will be discussed in later sections in the context of their family relationships.

There were important age differences in children's ability to conceptualize sex-differences, and in the kind of sex-role identity issues they were struggling to define. But whereas their conceptualizations of sex-role and sex differences were age related and often bipolar, their behavior and personality characteristics were androgynous. This is important in relation to Biller's (1969) finding that measures of sex-role adoption as evaluated by the child's teachers do not correlate with the frequently used measures of sex-typing. It would seem that traditional measures of sex-role development are evaluating a cognitive stage rather than assessing what the child actually does.

Since there is no easy correlation between the work allocation of adults and the sex-role identity of their children, other patterns of influence and relationship inside and outside the families need to be examined to explain the children's general androgyny. The study took place in a liberal academic community, and the influence of culture and peers would contribute to children's androgynous development. The impact

of the feminist movement was evident in the older children's (boys' and girls') discussion of sex differences. Since the children in non-traditional families were for the most part younger (see Table II), a comparison of their "feminist consciousness" with that of the children from traditional families is not possible except in a few cases. In general, feminist issues seemed to be as prevalent in community life and in the schools as in the families, although there are exceptions among the families which will be discussed in a later section. In answer to my question, "How do you think me and women are different?", 14-year-old Alan Robertson at first faltered and asked me what kind of an answer I wanted to hear. He then went on to speak in a spontaneous manner about the ways in which sex discrimination is destructive to the society. Twelve-year-old Irene Martin in spite of her more traditionally sex-typed activity preferences talked about sex-roles with what her mother called "a good women's lib line." Evelyn Hurley, age 14, spoke quite eloquently about what she liked and didn't like in feminist goals for women based in part on her readings of Ms. magazine. All three of these children are from families labelled in the study as traditional.

Despite this broader cultural influence, however, in general the children in junior high and high school agreed that androgyny is a difficult position to maintain in their peer culture. Most of the androgynous children, particularly those in junior high and high school, talked about feeling marginal in relation to peers and attributed this specifically to their androgynous characteristics. One way several of these children maintained their androgyny was by being extra competent in the skills of their own sex, thus successfully protecting them from ridicule or from

Table II

Age Distribution of Children

	Non-traditional Families			Traditional Families		
	name	age	grade	name	age	grade
Pre-School	Edward Singer	4	N			
	Marc Green	5	K			
Elementary School	Peter Bennett	6	1st			
	Jessica Greene	8	3rd			
	Gloria Bennett	8	3rd	Debby Warren	8	3rd
				Roger Hurley	11	5th
Junior High	Brian Bennett	12	6th			
	Saraellen Thomas	12	7th	Irene Martin	12	7th
	Richard Singer	12	7th			
	Paul Thomas	13	8th	Danny Martin	13	8th
				Tommy Martin	13	8th
				Alan Robertson	14	8th
				Evelyn Hurley	14	8th
				Ann Warren	14	8th
Senior High				Nicholas Hurley	16	10th
				Dave Hurley	17	11th
				Gail Robertson	17	11th
				Bruce Hurley	18	12th

being cross-sex typed. This was a particularly salient theme for the boys. Paul Thomas and Danny Martin, two boys both from non-traditional families who were suffering most from the derision of the same-sex peers, were the only two boys who did not balance their cross-sex interests and characteristics with physical strength and skill in sports. In contrast, Tommy, Danny's twin, and Richard Singer, also from a non-traditional family, achieved the more social secure balance. The older children of both sexes agreed that the greatest pressure for sex-role conformity in their age group is on boys, particularly in junior high school, although the girls are submitted to the subtler pressure of social exclusion. Ann Warren, from a traditional family, wondered whether she would be able to withstand the pressure to dress attractively and give up competitive sports, and looked with some foreboding at the sexual pressures of high school and college.

The sex-role socialization data available on the children has implications for their immediate experience but does not predict where these children are headed as adults and possible future parents. Both the child and adult data strongly suggest that any analysis of sex-role has to be specific to the developmental stage and life situation of the individual, since the demands of a stage and situation seem to determine the kinds of sex-role identity issues the individual is struggling to define. A developmental stage analysis divided the children into four stages, roughly corresponding to the school grade groups used in Table II. At each stage the children shared similar sex-role identity issues, stage-related issue similarity apparently far outweighing issue differences that might be expected from contrasting family backgrounds. Some

differentiation by family of origin was apparent in the older children, and these differences will be addressed in the section on parent-child relationships.

Edward Singer and Marc Greene, both of preschool age, had the sexual concerns of the Oedipal stage child, giggling excitedly about their mommy's breasts; construing sex differences concretely, they differentiated men and women on the basis of biopolarized physical characteristics. The elementary school children were continuing the cognitive exploration of sex differences, in which social sex-role definitions are biopolarized in order to be understood. They had much less to say on the differences between men and women than on the topic of their developmental moment, the differences between elementary school boys and girls. The junior high school children, entering adolescence and the beginning of sexual development, evidenced polarizations centered around the sexual component of sex-role. The girls faced questions of attractiveness and popularity, the boys questions of aggressiveness and power, and both sexes looked to their same-sex peers for answers. Many of these junior high school age children experienced themselves outside the mainstream of their peer culture in their sex-role identity, and showed a struggle between two important needs: maintaining their personal sex-role identity with its non-conforming elements, and remaining acceptable to their peers. Most resolved this by finding a group of peers with similar interests within the school. By high school and mid-adolescence, love and acceptance remain questions but they are now also being asked of opposite sex peers. Questions of work and competence became more salient as the adolescents faced college and career choice points.

We con't know where these children are going, but we do know where their parents have gone as well as some information about their families of origin. It becomes important next to examine the family of origin material presented retrospectively by the adults in the study, before continuing an analysis of their present development and their relationships in their present families.

Parental Families of Origin: Traditional and Non-traditional

The most striking pattern distinguishing non-traditional from traditional adults was the non-traditional adults' felt emotional distance from their parents and their critical rejection of their parents' life styles. The pattern is consistent with the finding of Lipman-Blumen (1972) that women with a "contemporary" sex-role ideology were more often distant from their parents and critical of their life-style than traditional women. The data further suggest that this rejecting relationship to the family of origin is a characteristic of both spouses. This was true for the Thomas, Greene and Singer couples, all of whom felt distant from and angry at their parents and shared a resolve to create a different kind of family pattern. This shared stance of both spouses seemed to exist from adolescence and to be an important element of their attraction. For the Greenes, the pattern took the form of Loraine's pulling Eric away from his too-close relationship to his mother by encouraging a critical view of his family. Only the Bennetts, of the non-traditional couples, both feel close to their families of origin. They are at the same time the most traditional of the non-traditional couples in that Bob does not fully share childcare responsibility. For the couples in which

both the husband and the wife's work role included shared parenting as well as shared employment, both husband and wife maintained a critical distance from their families of origin.

In contrast, the traditional adults generally felt closer to their families of origin and were more approving of their family's life styles. This was particularly true for George Warren, Frank Robertson, Lea and Jim Hurley, and Nancy and Steve Martin. Carol Warren rejected her father and stepmother's parenting style and accepted George's family of origin as a model. Susan Robertson was also disapproving of her mother's parenting style and resolved to be a less controlling parent than her mother, but she describes herself as passively accepting her mother's direction and discusses her relationship with her mother without the strong criticism or anger that is characteristic of the non-traditional adults.

The most notable thing about the patterns of identification in the adult's families of origin is their complexity. No one family of origin variable stands out alone in "explaining" the present work choices of the adults. Rather, some key elements seem to combine in forming the total picture. These include the personality characteristics of both parents, their work choices and feelings of satisfaction in these, composition of the sibling group and differential parental treatment of siblings. Most of the adults described themselves as influenced by or similar to both parents, although they also distinguished a parent to whom they felt closer or with whom they were more identified. For a number of adults, work choice was strongly influenced by their desire to become closer to the more distant parent, as in Lea Hurley's choice of music in relationship to her father. Patterns of influence were differ-

ent for the women than for the men, so that the discussion to follow will examine the dimensions for men and women separately.

The non-traditional women showed the strong influence of a closer relationship with the dominant spouse in the marital pair, male or female. For Sara Thomas, Loraine Greene, and Judy Bennett, this meant primary identification with a dominant mother who was highly critical of her weaker husband. These relationships were not necessarily positive; Sara Thomas and Loraine Greene describe their relationships with their mothers as tense and experienced their mothers as critical. Judy Bennett was the only woman of the three to have a positive relationship with her dominant mother.

Adele Singer's primary identification with with her dominant, traditional father. She had a positive relationship with her dominant father and a negative relationship with her traditional mother. At the same time, she describes herself as similar to both parents and identifies with characteristics of both.

The non-traditional women also show other androgynous influences within their families of origin: Sara Thomas modeled an androgynous older sister, Adele Singer modeled a masculine older brother, and Judy Bennett was the favorite grandchild of her patriarchal maternal grandfather with whom she identified.

The traditional women show the influence of more traditional parental marital arrangements, in which the husband was dominant in three of the four cases. This was reversed only for Susan Robertson, who shares the pattern of the non-traditional women in her identification with a dominant mother. However, Susan's case seems to be an instance of

too much dominance, in that she describes her mother as utterly controlling and herself as utterly acquiescent, in contrast to the more rebellious daughters who ended up in the non-traditional group. Carol Warren rejected her father and stepmother's traditional family but her models were other traditional marriages, particularly her husband's. Lea Hurley describes herself as more identified with her mother, who while she was an androgynous and competent woman, was in relation to her husband the less dominant spouse. Nancy Martin was strongly identified with her mother who chose to be the less dominant partner in her marital relationship. Nancy's family further differentiated powerfully in their expectations for her brothers and herself.

The non-traditional men showed the influence of an androgynous primary relationship in an assortment of family relationships. William Thomas felt closest to his two older sisters. Pressured to succeed by a patriarchal father, he felt more identified with his mythical biological mother who died when he was two. Eric Greene identified with a passive, alcoholic father and an older brother of similar bent. All were dominated by a critical mother. Eric's strongest work influence was a woman art teacher who provided him with a supportive relationship outside his family. Joel Greene felt identified with both his mother and his moody father, a kosher butcher aspiring to be a violinist. He was also close to three younger sisters. Bob Bennett felt closest to his androgynous, demanding mother although he also felt close to his father and felt that his place in the family was as the oldest son.

The traditional men tend to show the primary influence of a traditional father. This is most clearly the case for Frank Robertson and

Steve Martin. George Warren identified earlier in his life with his mother and later in his life with his father. His personality characteristics are androgynous; his orientation towards work choice and marriage are more traditional, although they also show some influence of this androgynous personality. Jim Hurley was closest to his mother whom he described as the truly dominant spouse although she and his father maintained a traditional marital arrangement. He felt most identified with his father and wanted to be closer to him.

Family Developmental Cycle

While the family of origin material shows some provocative influences on the sex-role development of the adults, the data also suggest the importance of other influences in adult life. These include the impact of adult life stages such as professional education, marriage and parenthood as well as the influences of cultural change. The feminist movement has been a major influence for the adults, primarily for the women and by extension for the men. At these later developmental points in the life cycle the family of origin material re-emerges as one of the influences on the individual which combines with life stage and situational demands to create the patterns of sex-role themes.

During courtship and early marriage, prior to the birth of the first child, the differences between traditional and non-traditional couples were indistinct. While couples delayed the birth of children--see the Warrens, the Robertsons (both traditional), the Thomases, the Greenes, and the Bennetts (all non-traditional)--the wife and husband both worked. Household demands were minimal. Therefore, even though

traditional wives had major household responsibilities whereas non-traditional couples shared this work, the work load was light enough that it did not become an issue in the marriages.

The three couples who had children shortly after the marriage--Hurley, Martin (both traditional), and Singer (non-traditional)--incorporated the oldest child into the early development of the marital relationship. Premature parenthood caused a high level of stress for the couples, since they had to adjust to the parenting role while their marital relationship was still forming. In the context of these particularly demanding role shifts, one would expect family of origin material to emerge more dramatically. According to developmental theory, the demands of a new stage would first be met with regression, then followed by attempts at adaptation and possible reorganization at a higher level of development. For these three couples, the families of origin became tangibly involved when the first child was born. The Martins were the youngest parents in the sample and their entry into parenthood was further complicated by the birth of twins. They spent several months with Nancy's family so that her mother would help her with the care of the children. Similarly, the Hurleys were joined by Jim's parents, and the Singers were joined by Adele's parents following the birth of the first child.

Not long thereafter the three couples split along traditional and non-traditional lines in adjusting to the simultaneous demands of marriage and parenting. Jim Hurley and Steve Martin withdrew from family into work, whereas Joel Singer became increasingly involved with childcare. By the end of Richard Singer's first year, Adele and Joel had completely

exchanged parenting roles. Both returned to school, and Adele worked part-time while Joel took responsibility for childcare. The Singers saw this arrangement as consistent with their initial vision of marital work arrangements in which Adele would support the family with her teaching, thus enabling Joel to write. The circumstances of the Singer's restructuring of work allocation included Richard's difficult infancy. Richard's difficulties left Adele with a burden of guilt about shirking her responsibility as a mother, and created lasting distance in her relationship with Richard. Thus, from its earliest infancy the child begins to influence the development of both the individual parents and their marital relationship, which in turn influences the parent-child relationship.

The circumstances of the first child's birth were important also for the couples who delayed the birth of their first child. The Warrens had intended to delay childbearing until they felt better established financially, and Carol's accidental pregnancy a year and a half after their marriage disrupted the equilibrium they had achieved in their marital relationship. The loss of Carol's income and increased financial responsibility of a child triggered a series of geographical moves which made their adjustment to the parenting role more difficult. Under stress, the family of origin experience of both adults becomes more critical: Carol found the parenting experience particularly difficult because of her lack of a maternal role model, her personal insecurity and feelings of incompetence, and the lessened availability of the marital relationship she had grown accustomed to as a source of support. George withdrew from the family into his work, as he had seen his father do in his family of origin. The family did not return to a state of equilibrium until

after their return to this area seven years later. These circumstances had an important impact on Carol's early relationship with Ann, and their influence distanced their relationship.

The Robertsons had the opposite experience with the birth of their first child in that they tried for a year to conceive before Susan became pregnant and Gail was born four years into the marriage. In spite of the contrast in planning, unexpected circumstance intervened to create similarities. Susan returned to a full schedule of activities too quickly after Gail's birth. This precipitated hemorrhaging and Susan spent several weeks recuperating in the hospital. Frank was therefore more involved with the infancy of their first child than with the later infancy of their son, Alan. Although Susan and Gail are described as most similar in the family, their emotional distance may be in part explained by the difficult circumstances following Gail's birth.

Of the three non-traditional couples who delayed the birth of their first child--the Thomases, Greenes, and Bennetts--only the Bennetts restructured their work arrangements around their first child's birth. The Thomases retained a traditional arrangement, in which Sara stopped work during her first pregnancy and took on sole household and childcare responsibilities while William took on sole financial responsibility. Their crisis and restructuring came later, and there seem to be several reasons why the birth of their first child did not involve the traumatic elements which seemed to be present in other couples. First, both the Thomases were older, had already undergone significant personal changes and instability, and were ready to settle into prescribed roles. Also, at the time of Paul's birth they remained in a familiar city where both

had previously worked and subsequently maintained contacts. William was finishing his graduate work and was somewhat more available than he would be otherwise to provide support and help with childcare.

The birth of the Greene's first child, Jessica, was also unstressful, and the restructuring of their childcare responsibilities came later in the marriage. In the four years preceding Jessica's birth, the Greenes had balanced their marital relationship around their successful shared woodcrafts studio. Loraine was in her early 30's and felt it was the time to have children; Eric felt children would be too disruptive to their lifestyle, but she insisted and he finally agreed. Jessica enterd a stable and well-established marital relationship, and the studio easily incorporated a playpen where Loraine could watch Jessica while she worked. The Greene's crisis and restructuring followed the birth of their second child around increased demands of caring for both a toddler and an infant.

The Bennett's delayed the birth of their first child for five years because they wanted time to work out their marital relationship before they brought in a third person. During those five years, both were developing professionally, although Judy had subordinated her work to Bob's until shortly before the birth of their oldest son, Brian. The year before Brian's birth, Judy experienced a crisis in her professional development. She had been working as a secretary in a counseling office, had begun individual therapy, and realized she wanted to take more independent steps in developing her work. At the same time Bob, working with a small firm, had just purchased a slum housing project with their shared savings without asking Judy's consent. Events combined to precipitate

a restructuring of the decision making process in their marriage. The year Brian was born, Judy began graduate school in social work. She and Bob had begun to renegotiate power and decision making in their marriage, and had taken on significantly increased financial responsibility for renovating their slum houseing project. They moved into this housing project early in Brian's infancy. Because of the multitude of personal and relational transitions the Bennetts were making during this period in their lives, their trasition to parenthood was a difficult one and affected their relationship with Brian. In the midst of this difficult period, they began the first of their communal living arrangements which alleviated the pressure on Judy of heavy schoolwork and childcare demands. She has continued to choose the alternative of communal childcare rather than involve Bob more directly in childcare responsibilities.

The above material suggests that the demands of the transition from courtship to the marital role pale beside the demands of the transition to parenthood. The data show the importance of stage of marital relationship development and the status of other transitional and situational factors in determining the impact of childbirth on the adults. This in turn becomes an important element in the parent-child relationships, and begins the development of patterns of closeness and identification. The oldest child will inevitably have a unique place in relation to her/his parents, since she/he introduces them to the parenting stage in their life cycle. These patterns will be further discussed in the final section of the discussion examining patterns of identification and parent-child relationships.

Later children. As the family developmental cycle continues, mari-

tal, professional and parental roles develop with their own stages that are at the same time interrelated. In general, nearly all couples in the study tended to focus on professional and parental responsibilities to the exclusion of the marital relationship. The marriage became the cohesive base which commanded chroeography of other role responsibilities, rather than a focus in itself. After the birth of the first child, the demands of child and career development seemed to absorb all the couples' available energy. For five of the eight families--Warren, Robertson (both in the traditional), Thomas, Greene and Singer (all in the non-traditional)--the second child remained the youngest. The Warrens and the Singers seemed to react to the stress of their transition to parenthood and the circumstances which accompanied it by delaying the birth of the second child substantially. Both waited until professional development and geographical moves had stabilized before having their second child.

The Robertsons were also at a point of greater stability as a family when their second child was born, which probably contributed to Susan's more relaxed and affectionate relationship with Alan than with their older daughter, Gail. Frank's recent loss of his job and the relocation which followed was the most serious stressful event for the family, and had its greatest impact on the individual adults and the marital relationship.

The Thomases had a more difficult time with the infancy of their younger daughter, Saraellen, than with their older son, Paul. At the time of Saraellen's birth they were making a geographical move to a rural area and William was beginning full-time teaching. Further, Saraellen

had a birth disorder which required corrective surgery and had several critical illnesses during her first year. As a result Sara describes this period as more stressful than that surrounding the birth of their first child. William recalls neither of the children's infancies as stressful, in part because he had professional concerns outside of the family which were the focus of his attention. The Thomases' restructuring of their work allocation was begun by the children's entry into school, which freed Sara's time to further develop her work interests. She was strongly influenced by the feminist movement in formulating the change in their work arrangements. At the same time, William was becoming increasingly frustrated by his limited time for his own artwork. In spite of their mutual agreement about the need for change, it required an extreme situation in which Sara was briefly hospitalized before they seriously initiated change in their work arrangements. At that point Sara began part-time work in her new area of interest, administration and adult education. Two years later they relocated in this area and reversed their work roles. The Thomases have found this most recent arrangement a difficult one, and they are again moving in the direction of more shared roles.

For the Greenes' the birth of their second child and the demands of childcare for a toddler and an infant stressed their family and precipitated a restructuring of their childcare arrangements. The change occurred at that point because the demands of childcare interferred with Loraine's work. Jessica no longer sat gurgling in her playpen, and Marc was a somewhat frail infant. Because the care of the children could no longer take place in her workspace, Loraine had increased difficulty

keeping up a level of work which she found satisfying, and grew increasingly frustrated with their work arrangement. By the time Marc was one year old, the "shit had hit the fan" in the form of the first issue of Ms. magazine. Feminist ideology helped Loraine crystallize the source of her discontent, and realize that alternative work arrangements were possible. It seems likely that Loraine found a feminist alternative so applicable, and Eric found it reasonable to meet her demands, because of their androgynous experiences in their families of origin.

The birth of the Martins' youngest daughter, Irene, following the birth of the twins was a comparatively smooth transition. The couple were still living in their hometown, while Steve was both working full time and attending school full-time. Following Irene's birth the couple again moved into Nancy's parents' home for a month so that Nancy's mother could help her with care of the infant. It is likely that Steve's absorption in his work and school responsibilities made him largely unavailable, so that Nancy's available source of support was her family of origin. Nancy's transition to parenthood had become an important new dimension in her relationship to her mother, and granted her the special place as a daughter that her parents had promised her. In this way, Nancy's return to her parents' home after her second childbirth seemed as much related to her continuing relationship with her mother as to her marital relationship.

In contrast to the birth of their first child, Brian, the circumstances of Gloria Bennett's birth three years later was must less stressful and more easily incorporated into Judy and Bob Bennett's work and family lives. Judy had finished school and begun work as a social worker

in a local agency. Bob's work had also stabilized and as a result their financial investment in the slum project was not as great a drain. They had worked through the issues of power in their relationship, dissolving the sexual affairs initiated during their turbulent period of transition. They continued to live communally so that Judy had easily available help with childcare.

The birth of the Bennetts' youngest child, Peter, took place during a new period of transition, and was again a stress point although without the intensity of Brian's birth. During Peter's early infancy, Bob was offered a job in this area and committed himself to the move without consulting Judy. Although both wanted to leave the inner city, Judy was angry that Bob had again made a major decision without consulting her and this precipitated a period of marital stress. Peter was born with a birth defect which required corrective leg braces, which meant that Judy was especially tied to the house. She describes this as a difficult period made bearable by her awareness that their isolated housing situation was transitional and by her developing contacts with the feminist community in the area.

The births of the four younger Hurley children were accidental, as had been the birth of the oldest child, Bruce. The births also occurred in the geographical transitions of Jim's educational and career development, and none of the children was born in the same city. During this period, Lea managed the household and childcare alone, protecting Jim from the demands of the family so he would be free to work. In maintaining this pattern of marriage and parenting, Lea is both replicating and exaggerating the pattern of her own mother who was also the

strong and competent woman who managed the household, including her husband, so that he would be free to work. Jim is also replicating the pattern in his parents' marriage of an externally traditional relationship which masks the husband's underlying dependency and the wife's strength.

Traditional/non-traditional. In comparing the family development material for traditional and non-traditional families, the differences in family development begin with differential adaptation to family life stage demands. The traditional families adapted to the demands of child-care and financial responsibilities through traditional role allocations, and continued with these patterns throughout their family life cycle. The non-traditional families all began with the traditional work arrangement as well, and all but the Bennett's restructured work arrangements in the face of high parenting role demands. The changes in all four non-traditional families were precipitated by the woman, at a point when traditional role demands were exacting too high a price to her professional development. The transitions of the traditional families are geared to the family life cycle, and primarily involve changes in the woman's role as she makes adjustments to the children's birth and growth.

Stresses on family relationships which accompany these transitions in both the traditional and non-traditional households also linked to the financial and parenting responsibilites which are present at different stages in the family life cycle. For the traditional families, these included the tensions inherent in the woman's transition to parenthood and in the man's professional development. Although a number of the traditional couples had personal needs and characteristics which were unsuited to these traditional roles, their family of origin backgrounds

seemed to combine with situational demands in a way that maintained a traditional role allocation. For example, Frank Robertson is a man with androgynous personal characteristics who would have preferred a work role that was not geared towards financial achievement. At the point when he lost his job, he took another corporate job rather than open up a carpentry shop due to both the influence of his demanding father in his family of origin and the financial needs of a nuclear family with older children approaching college. Similarly, Jim Hurley would like to reduce his teaching responsibilities to leave more time for writing, but the financial needs of his large family are already difficult for him to meet. The financial demands on the Hurleys may force Lea to find higher paying work than her music lessons, in spite of the fact that her preference is to structure her work around her family life.

In contrast, the transitions for the non-traditional couples involve an interplay between family stages of development and the individual needs of the adults. For the Bennetts the transition involved Judy's professional development which she had previously subordinated to the development of Bob's. For the Singers, the transition involved the stress of Richard's birth and Adele's realization that she needed to continue with her professional development. At that point, the couple initiated a work arrangement in which Joel took primary parenting responsibility because his writing was more flexible than her teaching. The Greenes restructred their parenting responsibilities at a point when the two children required a high level of care such that Loraine was unable to continue with her work. At that point, Loraine initiated a work schedule in which she and Eric equally divided household and childcare

responsibilities and both changed their work schedules to adapt to the children's needs. The Thomases made their transition when the children were older and required less care. Both Sara and William simultaneously became discontent with the limitations of their traditional family roles on their professional development. At the same time they recognized the need of the children to have a parenting figure available to them and the family's need for a secure salary. For this reason they reversed their family roles, because William's work was more flexible and could be geared to the children's schedules.

All the non-traditional couples remarked that role change is easier said than done. A paradox of their transitions was that whereas their moves to non-traditional work arrangements were selected as adaptive reconciliations of personal and family needs, the "cure" was in itself disequilibriating and required a more difficult process of adaptation than they had imagined. Although the couples entered these alternative work arrangements with strong personal needs and ideological convinction, they all discovered hidden costs in their androgynous arrangements. For the women, change meant increased guilt about neglecting their responsibilities as mothers. It also meant that a great deal of energy had to be expended in learning new role competencies and in keeping the new work allocations from regressing to their earlier distribution. The Greenes found that opting for spontaneity after the children became older and giving up the rigorous schedule they had first followed led them back to sex-typed task allocations. At the time of the interviews their childcare responsibilities reamined equally shared and they were in the process of renegotiating some compromise work arrangement. The

Singers and Bennetts had opted for sex-typed task allocation throughout since they felt they energy was needed for the more important responsibilities of profession and parenting.

The non-traditional couples who took on new roles found that new roles carry with them specific role-related pressures and stresses that they had not been fully prepared to encounter. Sara Thomas, in particular, and Adele Singer, Loraine Greene and Judy Bennett, to a lesser extent, expressed concern that they were bound to perform in their professional work by the financial needs of the family regardless of their own needs. William Thomas, Joel Singer, and Eric Greene found that the demands of childcare sapped energy that they had previously focused more exclusively on their work. Joel Singer spoke with acceptance about his present compromise between professional achievement and the children's needs, but still felt some resentment about the earlier period in which he had to write his dissertation during Richard's naps. William Thomas learned with some surprise that household and childcare responsibilites demand a high level of self-motivation and require a strong belief in one's work in the absence of a paycheck for reassurance. Eric Greene expressed a wish to blame the children for his failure to meet his aspirations in artistic work, but said Loraine objected and he himself knew better. Nevertheless, his taking on of parenting responsibilities required restructuring his work schedule around the children's waking hours, at a cost to his work.

The disequilibriating tension of role transition most clearly affected the marital relationships of the non-traditional families. Whereas these couples began their negotiations of work allocation based on

marital needs, the stress of role transition paired with the family demands and personal needs that had triggered the change placed the marriages under a great deal of pressure. Because of the complementarity of workroles, intensified by new demands on the family, changes initiated by one spouse always involved change in the role of the other. Thus, at a point when the individuals were most in need of their spouse's support, spouses were least available to each other because of the pressures linked to their own transitions. The Thomases demonstrated this process of self-absorption and insensitivity to the other's needs most clearly because of the dramatic reversal of their work roles. Since each had stepped into the other's old role, their personal struggles for competence involved some egocentric thrashing about. Although their discussions of work allocation sometimes had the appearance of competitive power struggles, in the context of their role transitions it became clear that these were primarily personal struggles for competence and security.

Feminist movement influence. The feminist movement was an important influence for all the families, although it seemed to affect traditional and non-traditional families somewhat differently. For the non-traditional families, the changes in work allocation and the changes in the marital relationship which ensued were priorities. These couples felt that they were providing their children with egalitarian role models. Beyond that they didn't see it necessary to intervene in providing their children with feminist socialization influences. In contrast, several of the parents in the traditional families felt that precisely because they had failed to provide their children with egalitarian role models it was important that they help provide their children with more

flexible role options through more active socialization. This was an issue for Carol Warren, who stated that for her the feminist movement had come too late and described her feminist support groups as a major influence in her relationships with her children. Nancy and Steve Martin also described a concern with their impact as traditional role models, and described their attempts to encourage their children in androgynous activities. The feminist movement was a presence in the other traditional families as well. Susan Robertson described the feminist influence in the community as one of the factors in her decision to return to work.

Patterns of Identification: Influences on Parent/child Relationships

The case studies and summaries of sex-role themes indicate the importance of two related elements in the process of parent/child identification: the interactive nature of identification, and the replication of patterns of relationship from families of origin. Identification is generally studied as a process in which the child actively takes in the behaviors of the same-sex parent. From this perspective of process, the parent is seen as a figure who simply goes about her or his business while the child observes. In contrast, the patterns of identification in the eight families studied show an active parental role in establishing pattern of identification. The following discussion of identification patterns divides the families into three groups on the basis of number and sex distribution of children. The first group consists of the three families with two opposite sex children--the Robertsons (traditional),

the Thomases, and the Greenes (both non-traditional). The second group consists of the two families with two same-sex children--the Warrens (traditional) and the Singers (non-traditional). The final group consists of the three families with more than two children--the Hurleys, the Martins (both traditional) and the Bennetts (non-traditional).

For the families with two children--the Warrens and Robertsons (traditional), the Thomases, Greenes, and Singers (non-traditional)--patterns of identification consistently divided the family into two parent/child pairs. These pairs were described as closest and most similar by general family consensus. In the three families where the children were opposite sex pairs, the division was consistently based on same-sex characteristics. This was the case for one traditional family, the Robertsons, who pair Susan with 17-year-old Gail and Frank with 14-year-old Alan; and for two non-traditional families; the Thomases, who pair Sara with 12-year-old Saraellen and William with 13-year-old Paul, and the Greenes, who pair Loraine with 8-year-old Jessica and Eric with 5-year-old Marc.

At the same time, powerful experiences related to the first born complicated these same-sex patterns of relationship. Susan and Gail have a somewhat distant and mutually critical relationship which may have its origins in Susan's hospitalization shortly after Gail's birth. Their relationship is further a replication of Susan's relationship with her own controlling mother in her family of origin. Sara and William Thomas are both involved in identifying with Paul's present adolescent crisis, which indicates that specific life stages may result in revised or additional patterns of identification. The Thomases show the repli-

cation of each of their relationships with their same-sex parent in their relationships with both children. The Greenes show the replication of their relationships to both parents in their relationships with both children; in this way, Jessica is three times identified with dominant women and Marc is three times identified with passive men.

One final pattern which seems important is the influence of sibling relationship in the patterns of identification. In all three cases of opposite sex sibling pairing, the sister is more dominant and assertive than the brother. For the Robertson and Greene siblings, the pattern seems to combine the older age of the sister and her identification with a more dominant mother. For the Thomas children, the developmental edge of the older child, Paul, seems counterbalanced by his identification with an androgynous father who is less dominant than Paul's mother in the marital relationship.

Two families--the Singers and the Warrens--had two same-sex children. In these families, patterns of identification were formed by the circumstances of the older child's birth. Both Carol Warren and Adele Singer had a difficult time during the infancies of their oldest children, at a point when they were feeling vulnerable about their competence as mothers. Both their older children became identified with their fathers: Ann with George Warren, Richard with Joel Singer. This seemed to occur interactively, in part through the mother's need to distance herself from the painful experience by creating distance from the child, in part through the father's willingness to step in, in part through the child's active turning to her/his father in the face of the mother's anxiety and discomfort.

The larger families presented patterns of identification which involved the sibling constellations in the parental families of origin and the present families. For the Bennetts, identification with same-sex parents in their families of origin was a powerful influence in both Judy's and Bob's relationship to their older son, Brian. Judy replicated her mother's power struggles with Judy's younger brother. Bob replicated his own relationship with his somewhat distant, demanding father. In contrast to the parental relationship with Brian, the two younger siblings have much less conflictful relationships with both parents. Gloria and Judy are strongly identified with each other, and Gloria's sex-typed activities seem related to the pleasure Judy in taking in having produced a child-swan when she feels like an ugly duckling. Brian's sex-typed activities seem related to his identification with his father, and an active rejection of identification with his mother based on their conflictual relationship. The youngest son, Peter, seems androgynously identified with his mother and older brother, whom he looks up to as a model.

The Martins show the influence of both Nancy and Steve's identification with their same-sex parent in their families of origin. Nancy identifies with her mother and is replicating her mother's pattern of preferring the boys over the old girl. Her relationship with Tommy seems based on her parents' relationship to her "golden boy" older brother who has the same name. She identifies her child-self with Irene, and on the basis of this is predicting that Irene will replicate her own pattern of sexual acting-out in adolescence. Steve is identifying with his traditional, authoritarian father in his relationship to his

children, and is further replicating his father's sexually protective stance towards his sister in his own relationship with Irene.

The Hurleys show a predominant pattern of sibling influence, as well as the important parental role in differentiating between sibling groups. The three older boys, Bruce, Dave, and Nicholas, are a natural age-and-sex sibling subset which has been reinforced by the parental view of them as the "three big boys." Evelyn and Roger form an essentially separate sibling group who are at the same time strongly influenced by their parents' differential treatment. Susan is replicating her family of origin pattern of valuing the boys over the girls while at the same time strongly identifying with the girl. She has further replicated the birth order pattern in which the oldest child is criticized and the youngest child is indulged. Jim is also replicating his family of origin pattern in which his parents were highly demanding and critical of him while they were less demanding and more indulgent of his younger sister.

The families according to shared family structure showed some similar themes in their patterns of identification. The above three family groups which shared the number and sex distribution of the children also shared major themes in their patterns of identification. The families with two children divided the family into two parent/child pairs. Those with opposite-sex children created the pairs along same sex-lines. The families with two same-sex children seemed to create their pattern of identification from the circumstances of the oldest child's birth. The families with more than two children showed the predominant influence of sibling relationships and of parental patterns in differentiating between siblings. These patterns indicate that the

age and sex distribution of the children in a family constellation are another element which contributes to patterns of identification.

Conclusion

The thesis began with a distinction between traditional and non-traditional families, and asked about differences in patterns of socialization between these two family groups. One major difference between traditional and non-traditional couples is that traditional couples more self-consciously reject the life-styles of their own parents. At the same time, they attempt transitions in role allocation which are seen as necessary, although they are disequilibriating for the individual as well as the couple. In their attempts at reorganizing after the impact of this transitional experience, they often regress in both marital and parenting roles to what family systems theory would call a less differentiated stance in relation to the family of origin. The paradox of the non-traditional family is that the very step which a couple takes to differentiate from family of origin is itself a disequilibriating and potentially regressive move. The transition seems to trigger regression to a less differentiated position than that which initiated it.

In conclusion, the thesis indicates that the model of androgyny is an appropriately complex perspective from which to examine equally complex patterns of family socialization. The data support a family-developmental view for the formation of androgynous sex-role identity, and further, that sex-role development continues throughout the life cycle. New developmental stages demand the new integration of old bipolarities. The model of androgyny, like the study of family develop-

ment, is in formative stages, and further research is necessary to further develop an integrative view of the process of sex-role socialization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Astin, H., Parelman, A., & Fisher, A. Sex-roles: A research bibliography. Rockville: DHEW, 1975.

Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Bem, D. & Allen, H. On predicting some of the people some of the time: The search for cross-situational consistencies in behavior. Psychological Review, 1974, 81(6), 506-520.

Bem, S. L. Probing the promise of androgyny. In A. Kaplan & J. Bean (eds.), Beyond sex-role stereotypes: Readings towards a psychology of androgyny. Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1976.

Bem, S. L. Sex-role adaptability. One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Biller, H. Father dominance and sex-role development in kindergarten-age boys. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 87-94.

Biller, H. A multiaspect investigation of masculine development in kindergarten-age boys. Genetic Psychological Monographs, 1968, 76, 89-138.

Block, J. H. Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28(6), 512-526.

Block, J., Von der Lippe, A., & Block, J. H. Sex-role and socialization patterns: Some personality concomitants and environmental antecedents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973,

41(3), 321-341.

Bowen, M. Toward the differentiation of a self in one's own family. In J. Framo (ed.), Family interaction. New York: Springer Publishing Company, 1971, 111-173.

Brim, O. G. Family structure and sex-role learning by children: A further analysis of Helen Roch's data. Sociometry, 1958, 21, 1-16.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Freduian theories of identification and their derivations. Child Development, 31, 15-40.

Burton, J. & Whiting, J. The absent father and cross-sex identity. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1961, 7, 85-97.

Carlson, R. Understanding women: Implications for personality theory and research. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28(2), 17-32.

Carlson, R. Sex-differences in ego-functioning. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, 267-277.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-Femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80(5), 389-407.

Fauls, L. B. & Smith, W. D. Sex-role learning of five-year olds. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1956, 89, 105-117.

Fenichel, O. The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis. New York: Norton, 1945.

Fling, S. & Manesovitz, M. Sex-typing in nursery school children's play interests. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 7, 146-152.

Freud, S. Three essays on the theory of sexuality. Standard Edition, London: Hogarth Press, V. 7, 125-245, 1953.

Freud, S. Some psychical consequences of the anatomical differences between the sexes (1925). In J. Strackey (ed.), The standard edi-

tion of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud, Vol. 19. London: Hogarth Press Standard.

Greenstein, J. M. Father characteristics and sex-typing. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 271-277.

Harris, I. The promised seed. Glencoe: Free Press, 1964.

Hartley, R. Children's concepts of male and female roles. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 6, 84-91.

Hartley, R. A developmental view of female sex-role definition and identification. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 3-16.

Hetherington, E. M. Effects of paternal absence on sex-typed behaviors in negro and white pre-adolescent males. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 87-91.

Hetherington, E. M. A developmental study of the effects of sex of the dominant parent on sex-role preference, identification, and imitation in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 188-194.

Hetherington, E. M. & Frankie, G. Effect of parental dominance, warmth, and conflict on imitation in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 119-125.

Hoffman, L. Effects of maternal employment on the child--a review of the research. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10(2), 204-228.

Houston, H. Familial correlates of sex-role development in boys: An exploratory study. Personality: An International Journal, 1970, 1(4), 303-317.

Kaplan, A. & Bean, J. Beyond sex-role stereotypes: Readings toward a psychology of androgyny. Boston: Little-Brown, 1976.

Kagan, J. Acquisition and significance of sex-typing and sex-role identity. In M. Hoffman & L. Hoffman (eds.), Review of child development research, Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage, 1964, 137-167.

Kohlberg, L. A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes. In E. Maccoby (ed.), The development of sex differences. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1966, 82-173.

Kohlberg, L. The development of moral character and ideology. In M. Hoffman & L. Hoffman, (eds.), Review of child development research, Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage, 1964, 383-431.

Kohlberg, L. & Ziegler, E. The impact of cognitive maturity on the development of sex-role attitudes in the years 4 to 8. Genetic Psychological Monographs, 1967, 75, 84-165.

Lipman-Blumen, J. How ideology shapes women's lives, Scientific American, 1972, 226, 34-42.

Loevinger, J. & Wessler, R. Measuring ego development, Vol. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Loevinger, J. The meaning and measurement of ego development. American Psychologist, 1966, 21, 195-206.

Maccoby, E. The development of sex differences. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Maccoby, E. & Jacklin, C. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1975.

Mischel, W. Sex-typing and socialization. In P. Mussen (ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology, Vol. II. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Mischel, W. Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Mischel, W. A social learning view of sex-differences in behavior. In E. Maccoby (ed.), The development of sex differences. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1966, 56-81.

Moulton, P. W., Burnstein, E., Liberty, P., & Altucher, N. The patterning of parental affection and dominance as a determinant of guilt and sex-typing. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 356-363.

Mowrer, O. H. Learning theory and behavior. New York: Wiley, 1960.

Mussen, P. (ed.) Carmichael's manual of child psychology, Vol. I and II. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Mussen, P. Early sex-role development. In D. Goslin (ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Mussen, P. & Distler, L. Masculinity, identification, and father-son relationship. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 350-356.

Mussen, P. & Rutherford, E. Parent-child relations and parental personality in relation to young children's sex-role preferences. Child Development, 1963, 34, 589-607.

Parson, T. & Bales, R. F. Family, socialization and interaction process. Glencoe: Free Press, 1955.

Piaget, J. Piaget's theory. In P. Mussen (ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology, vol. 1. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Pleck, J. & Sawyer, J. Men and masculinity. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Raush, H. Persons, situations, and junctures. Paper presented at the International Conference on Interactional Psychology. Stockholm,

Sweden, 1975.

Rebeca, M., Hefner, R., & Oleshansky, B. A model of sex-role transcendence. In A. Kaplan & J. Bean. Readings toward a psychology of androgyny. Boston: Little-Brown, 1976, 90-97.

Sutton-Smith, B. & Rosenberg, B. G. The sibling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.

Rosenberg, B. G. & Sutton-Smith, B. Sex-role identity and sibling composition. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1971, 118(1), 29-35.

Rossi, A. Transition to parenthood. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1968, 30(1), 26-39.

Rutherford, E. A note on the relation of parental dominance as a decision maker in the home to children's ability to make sex-role discriminations. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1969, 114(2), 185-191.

Sears, P. Child rearing factors related to the playing of sex-typed roles. American Psychologist, 1953, 8, 431.

Sears, R., Maccoby, E., & Sevin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Sears, R., Rau, L., & Alport, R. Identification and child rearing. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1965.

Spence, J., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.

Torman, W. Family constellation. (second edition). New York: Springer Publishing Company, 1969.

Vroegh, K. The relationship of birth order and sex of siblings to gender

role identity. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 4(3), 407-411.

Wapner, S., Kaplan, B., & Cohen, S. An organismic-developmental perspective for understanding transactions of men and environments. Environment and Behavior, 1973, 5(3), 255-289.

Ward, W. Sex-role preference and parental imitation within groups of middle-class whites and lower-class blacks. Psychological Reports, 1972, 30, 651-654.

Werner, H. The concept of development from a comparative and organismic point of view. In D. Harris (ed.), The concept of development. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957, 125-148.

Werner, H. Comparative psychology of mental development. Chicago: Wilcox & Follett, 1948.

Whiting, J. W. M. Resource mediation and learning by identification. In I. Iscoe & H. Stevenson (eds.), Personality development in children. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960.